

Canada

Parliament  
Senate

Special Committee on Mass Media

Report

3

Government  
Publications

Perm.  
hold  
sh.

Available by mail from Information Canada, Ottawa,  
and at the following Information Canada bookshops:

HALIFAX  
1735 Barrington Street

MONTREAL  
Æterna-Vie Building, 1182 St. Catherine Street West

OTTAWA  
171 Slater Street

TORONTO  
221 Yonge Street

WINNIPEG  
Mall Center Building, 499 Portage Avenue

VANCOUVER  
657 Granville Street

or through your bookseller

Price: \$3.50

Catalogue No.YC 2-282/3-03

Price subject to change without notice

©  
Queen's Printer for Canada  
Ottawa, 1970



# **Good, Bad, or Simply Inevitable?**

**Selected Research Studies**

**Report of the  
Special Senate Committee on Mass Media**

**Volume III**

## The Special Senate Committee on Mass Media

---

The Honourable Keith Davey, *Chairman*

The Honourable L. P. Beaubien, *Deputy Chairman*

The Honourable Romuald Bourque

The Honourable Douglas D. Everett

The Honourable Harry W. Hays, P.C.

The Honourable Mary E. Kinnear

The Honourable J. M. Macdonald

The Honourable Charles R. McElman

The Honourable William J. Petten

The Honourable J. Harper Prowse

The Honourable Josie D. Quart

The Honourable Donald Smith

The Honourable Herbert O. Sparrow

The Honourable Frank C. Welch

The Honourable Paul Yzyk



## TERMS OF REFERENCE


On Tuesday, March 18, 1969, the Senate of Canada constituted the Special Senate Committee on Mass Media by approving the following resolution:

That a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed to consider and report upon the ownership and control of the major means of mass public communication in Canada, and in particular, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, to examine and report upon the extent and nature of their impact and influence on the Canadian public;

That the Committee have power to engage the services of such counsel and technical, clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the purpose of the inquiry; and

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses, to report from time to time and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee.

The Committee was reconstituted by the Senate during the second and third sessions of the 28th Parliament on October 29, 1969 and October 8, 1970.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

## Table of Contents

### Part I: The Media and the People, A Report by Martin Goldfarb Consultants

	<i>Page</i>
Preface . . . . .	3
Background and Purpose . . . . .	3
Method . . . . .	3
Results . . . . .	4
Highlights and Implications . . . . .	5
Introduction . . . . .	5
Media Use . . . . .	5
Media as News Purveyors . . . . .	6
Violence, Sex, Love, and Drugs . . . . .	6
Political Press Coverage . . . . .	6
Control/Censorship . . . . .	7
Ownership . . . . .	7
Advertising . . . . .	8
Image . . . . .	8
General Summary . . . . .	11
Media Use . . . . .	11
Media as News Purveyors . . . . .	14
Content . . . . .	16
Violence, Sex, Love, and Drugs . . . . .	22
Political Press Coverage . . . . .	24
Control/Censorship . . . . .	26
Ownership . . . . .	29
Advertising . . . . .	30
Image . . . . .	34
Detailed Tables . . . . .	39
The Concept of "Press" . . . . .	39
Belief in Reported News . . . . .	39
Importance of Media for Different Types of News . . . . .	41
Choice of Medium in Emergency News Crisis . . . . .	43
The Media and the Individual . . . . .	44
Media Usage for Information . . . . .	47
Government and Other Influences on the Press . . . . .	48
Information Levels—Five Years Ago and Today . . . . .	50

	<i>Page</i>
Easiest and Most Difficult Media . . . . .	51
The Media—Likes and Dislikes . . . . .	51
—Press, Politicians and Privacy . . . . .	53
The Media—Influence . . . . .	56
Reliance on the Media . . . . .	58
Knowledge of Various Issues . . . . .	59
✓ Dissemination of Information from the Government . . . . .	61
Newspapers—General . . . . .	61
✓ Politicians and the Press . . . . .	62
✓ Media Influence on Society . . . . .	63
Media Content—Violence, Sex, and Drugs Usage . . . . .	65
✓ Media Content—Does it Influence? . . . . .	66
Newspapers and Radio—For Whom? . . . . .	75
International, National, and Local News . . . . .	75
✓ Newspapers—Control and Readership . . . . .	77
Newsmagazines . . . . .	81
Media for News and Entertainment . . . . .	83
Watching the News . . . . .	85
Credibility of the TV Camera . . . . .	87
Responses to Media . . . . .	88
Children Under Ten and TV . . . . .	89
Violence, Sorrow, and Love . . . . .	91
Talking to TV and Radio . . . . .	95
Advertising . . . . .	95
Violence v Love . . . . .	101
Suitability Rating of Media for Different Age Groups . . . . .	103
Excitement and TV Programmes . . . . .	103
Media Ownership by Foreigners . . . . .	105
Views on Multiple Ownership . . . . .	107
News Reporting . . . . .	110
Canadian News Reporting—Optimistic or Pessimistic? . . . . .	112
Media as Sources of Information . . . . .	113
✓ Influence of Media on Attitudes . . . . .	116
What Media Do for People . . . . .	121
Censorship of Media . . . . .	124
Influence of School System v Influence of Advertising . . . . .	126
Television Viewing Habits/Newspaper Reading Habits . . . . .	128
Media Sensationalism . . . . .	129
✓ Canadian v American TV Programmes . . . . .	130
Media and People's Privacy . . . . .	132
Profanity in the Media . . . . .	133
Effect of Media on Attitudes to the United States and to French Canada . . . . .	134
The Freedom of the Media . . . . .	135
Amount of News . . . . .	137
✓ Media and Government Criticism . . . . .	138
Advice and Opinion from the Media . . . . .	139
Local Media—Ownership and Political Affiliation . . . . .	143
✓ Canadian Control of Media . . . . .	146
Fairness of Media to Police . . . . .	149
Information about Respondents . . . . .	150
Appendices . . . . .	154
Questionnaire Used . . . . .	154
Statistical Tolerances . . . . .	184



## Part II: Selected Print Media

	<i>Page</i>
Chapter 1: Canadian Newspaper Practice, Borden Spears . . . . .	187
Introduction . . . . .	187
Model Newspaper . . . . .	188
Journalism as a Profession . . . . .	192
A Renewed Commitment . . . . .	194
Up Against the Wall . . . . .	197
Current Trends . . . . .	205
Summary . . . . .	207
Chapter 2: Magazines in Canada, Dean Walker . . . . .	209
Introduction . . . . .	209
Yesterday and Tomorrow . . . . .	209
The Future . . . . .	215
Today . . . . .	216
Content and Impact . . . . .	232
Appendix I: Canadian Magazines by Size and Significance . . . . .	239
Appendix II: Canadian Magazines by Circulation . . . . .	240
Chapter 3: The Student Press in Canada, Barbara Sullivan . . . . .	241
Introduction . . . . .	241
A Contemporary History—The Sixties . . . . .	242
Student Newspaper Production . . . . .	248
Student Press Organizations . . . . .	253
Relations of the Student Press . . . . .	259
Recent Innovations in the Student Press . . . . .	264
French-Language Student Press . . . . .	266
Student Press and the Law . . . . .	267
Conclusion . . . . .	269
Chapter 4: The Underground Press in Canada, Barbara Sullivan . . . . .	271
Introduction . . . . .	271
Underground Press Production . . . . .	274
Underground Press Organizations . . . . .	279
Underground Press and the Canadian Law . . . . .	281



Part I

THE MEDIA AND THE PEOPLE

A Report by Martin Goldfarb  
Consultants





## PREFACE

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Special Senate Committee on Mass Media was instructed, as part of its terms of reference, to study "the impact and influence" of the mass media in Canada. A number of research papers were commissioned to examine various aspects of the make-up and operation of the industry. This study was undertaken to survey the effect of the media on consumers. What are the public's expectations, fears, hopes, concerns, satisfactions, disappointments? In particular, what roles in the lives of Canadians are played by newspapers, magazines, television, and radio? What needs are felt, and how are they being answered?

### METHOD

The study was conducted in two stages: an in-depth conceptual analysis, and a quantitative, or validation, survey. In the first stage, group interviews were conducted by qualified sociologists with men, women, and teen-agers from different education and income backgrounds in Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, and Quebec City. In addition, some personal in-depth interviews were conducted. The interviewers were Martin Goldfarb, Professor Marc Belanger in Montreal and Quebec, and Miss Marina Myles in Montreal.

In the interviews, environmental factors which affect attitudes, opinions, and knowledge—such as educational systems, family life, working conditions, and the media—were discussed. From an analysis of the group discussions, a number of hypotheses were developed as to the role, structure, and content of the media. These hypotheses were then incorporated in a questionnaire to form the second stage, the quantitative or validation phase. Only this second stage is herein reported.

The questionnaire was tested, and a national random probability sample was selected. A proportion of respondents was selected from each of the ten provinces in accordance with population distribution, including French-speaking individuals from Quebec and New Brunswick. All interviews were conducted personally in homes by experienced interviewers. The interviews took from two to six hours. In all, 2,254 Canadians, fifteen years of age and over, participated.

A detailed breakdown of the sample may be found in appendix as Basic Data, Sections E to H of this report, together with a copy of the questionnaire.

The study was conducted by Martin Goldfarb Consultants, Toronto, in October and November, 1969. The in-depth stage was carried out during the previous summer.

## RESULTS

The results are given under the following headings:

- I. Highlights and Implications
- II. General Summary
- III. Detailed Tables.

Respondents were asked in question one what they understood by the word "press." Following their answer, it was explained that by "press" was meant television, radio, newspapers, magazines, or any other mass medium for reporting news.

The General Summary is, for the most part, an analysis of the total-Canada scene. Where sub-groups differ in their response from the total average, the variance has been noted in the Highlights and Implications section, but not always in the General Summary. Sub-group data may be found in the Detailed Tables.

## Chapter 1

### HIGHLIGHTS AND IMPLICATIONS

#### INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes responses to the questionnaire in both general and specific terms. In some cases an awareness of the whole study provides a perspective for interpretation. On some issues, attitudes appear to be contradictory. What must be understood is that people often have more than one attitude toward a specific issue; responses will vary at different times and to different stimuli. What is important is to understand that these conflicting attitudes exist simultaneously. The overall objective is to achieve a perspective of the attitude milieu.

#### MEDIA USE

- \* Almost all Canadians use more than one medium every day to acquire information. Eight in ten use all of television, newspapers, and radio; one in five uses magazines.
- \* The average Canadian spends thirty to forty minutes daily reading a newspaper. The time spent, and attitudes on specific sections and editorial comment, can be seen in Table 38.
- \* About four in ten people receive a news magazine regularly, and about half of these read *Time*. Readers of news magazines tend to be those with a college education who are earning at least \$12,000 a year.
- \* For facts, background, and interpretation, people are more inclined to rely on newspapers than on television, radio, or magazines. Television is used for reports on special events (such as a moon landing) as well as for entertainment and relaxation.
- \* Two in three Canadians watch the news daily on television, and more than nine in ten watch television news at least once a week.
- \* Radio is background and hence is turned on for a large proportion of the day in many homes. It is easy to use and requires little effort or concentration. It is a low-involvement medium.
- \* On the basis of parents' estimates, children under ten watch television an average of twelve hours a week. Many parents try to discourage their children from watching what they consider to be too much television. Adult Canadians say

that the median number of hours per week they spend watching television is approximately thirteen. One in four watches at least twenty hours a week.

- \* Newspapers are regarded by more people as the best medium for information on such things as consumer goods, places to shop, changes in laws, taxes, Canadian economics, labour, Canadian politics, and national unity. Television is second, and radio a distant third. More than half the women in Canada and one-third of the men read horoscopes regularly or occasionally.

### MEDIA AS NEWS PURVEYORS

- \* Most Canadians think that news coverage has improved in the past five years, and they are generally satisfied with the amount of news they receive. They would probably be receptive to an increase in the proportion of national news. Canadians say that local news is more important than national or international news. This appears to be a way of saying that local areas want to retain their identity.
- \* Television is the most believed and most important medium for international news and for Canadian news of national importance. Newspapers are identified as the most believable and important for local news. The written word is believed especially when it is local. Radio is not far behind newspapers in satisfying local news needs. Local media are more trusted for news than national media.
- \* College-educated people rely less on television for international or national news than do people with less education. They more readily use magazines and newspapers.

### VIOLENCE, SEX, LOVE, AND DRUGS

- \* Many people complain that all the media carry too high a content of sex, violence, and drug usage. Television is the most often criticized, followed by newspapers and, at a considerable distance, by radio. There are many variations in attitude by regions, age levels, and education but there is an overall feeling that these subjects have been overplayed in the media. People seem to want not to be confronted with issues disturbing to their way of life.
- \* Magazines come in for considerable criticism with respect to sex and drug usage.
- \* Fewer than one in five feel that four-letter words should be permitted in either print or broadcast media.
- \* Attitudes toward violence are ambivalent; it is sometimes acceptable, sometimes not. Where violence occurs in war stories, slapstick comedy, or fighting in a hockey game, it is definitely acceptable. Where violence is related to personal anxieties and experiences such as a mother and father fighting, a student riot, or an assassination, it is perceived as contributing to a moral breakdown in society.
- \* Nudity and love-making are not acceptable on television.

### POLITICAL PRESS COVERAGE

- \* Coverage of news about government is generally regarded as satisfactory. People generally say that politicians and political parties receive fair treatment from the press.



- \* Most Canadians do not feel that the private lives of political figures should be reported. Farmers are most prone to say that private lives should be reported. They are either more curious or more suspicious than urban dwellers.
- \* Newspapers are the most often criticized for invasions of privacy. Press treatment of Prime Minister Trudeau is most often cited. At the same time, most people like to read and hear about him. Where bias occurs in the coverage of politicians, newspapers are considered to be the most guilty.
- \* Television is considered to be the medium most biased in favour of government ideas. Newspapers are considered most critical of government. This is not a negative attitude; people believe that governments should be criticized, and about 30% feel the media are not critical enough.

### CONTROL/CENSORSHIP

- \* About two-thirds of the people accept the principle of government regulatory power over radio and television. About one in five feel that there should be some regulatory agency to control the print media.
- \* Seven in ten Canadians believe that no medium has complete control over its own content. They believe there are outside influences which colour reporting of news. About two-thirds say that big business has this influence, and one-half say the federal government. Half of those who say the government colours news reporting believe this influence should be eliminated. One-third believe that advertisers control news content in some degree and four in ten believe that criminal elements have some influence.
- \* College-educated Canadians are most likely to say that big business can influence all media.
- \* About one in three believe that the federal or local police influence reporting. French Canadians are more prone than English Canadians to believe this. This is also true of people in the lower education categories.
- \* About four in ten believe the government should take steps to inform citizens, independently of what the media do.
- \* Three-quarters of Canadians say that some form of censorship is desirable for television, and half say that it should be applied to radio and newspapers. But when asked a similar question in a different context, eight in ten say that newspapers should be totally free from government control, while nearly two-thirds want government supervision of television and radio. A sizeable minority (22%) say that the media have too much freedom. Three out of four disagree. What people appear to be saying is that the controls now operating should continue. They do not want to give the media more freedom, nor do they want to reduce it. There is a fear that if controls are withdrawn, there will be an increased content of violence, sex, and drugs.

### OWNERSHIP

- \* Fewer than two in five Canadians know the names of local media owners, and even fewer are interested in knowing. In New Brunswick awareness of media ownership is significantly higher. More people are able to identify a newspaper with the support of a political party than a television or radio station.

- \* There is a strong feeling that Canadian media should be owned by Canadians. The most acceptable foreign owners would be Americans followed by the British. One-quarter of French Canadians would prefer French ownership. There is strong attitude resistance to one person's or one company's owning several media outlets in one local area, but there is less resistance to multi-media ownership, such as the various newspaper chains scattered across the country. Common ownership of different kinds of media is also fairly generally disliked.

## ADVERTISING

- \* Two out of three believe that advertising has an influence on their behaviour. More than four out of five say that advertising has a positive role in keeping people informed about products.
- \* For many people, newspaper advertising is news. This is especially true in the prairies and in small communities. Seven out of ten consider advertising to be a form of art. The worst things an advertisement can do are to mislead (32%), insult the intelligence (24%), and create indifference (23%). Only 3% name the exploitation of sex or violence.
- \* Nine out of ten Canadians would like to see the number of advertisements shown during a television movie better controlled. Television commercials are rated as more influential than advertisements in other media. Canadian adults believe that advertising of products which in their opinion can contribute to moral breakdown such as sleeping pills, cigarettes, liquor, and glue, should be banned.
- \* Dissatisfaction with television advertising relates largely to the timing and content of commercial messages. Most complaints centre about commercials in movies. No strong dissatisfaction is registered with programme content. People agree that the content of newspapers and radio should be Canadian but admit to liking American programmes on television.

## IMAGE

- \* Canadians are generally satisfied with the media in Canada. At the same time, there is a widespread suspicion that all media report the news in a way that slants the truth in a predetermined direction. This attitude is more general among the French Canadians than among other Canadians.
- \* Of the three media, television is considered the most exciting (92%) and influential (66%), radio the most immediate (59%), and newspapers the most personal (45%) and private (53%).
- \* When people think of the word "press" they think of newspapers (79%). Television, radio, and magazines are recognized as information media but not automatically included in the concept of the press.
- \* Television is an exciting but relaxing medium able to provide facts clearly but less able to give detailed background information. It brings reality to life to an extent that is sometimes frightening. It is particularly felt to be the medium for the whole family.



- \* Newspapers are felt to be the most essential medium, but also the most demanding of time and effort. They are the most diligent in keeping the public informed. More than the other media, they are perceived to represent the public conscience. They are also feared more than the other media for invasion of privacy. They are essential for reporting local events. Although useful for all adults, they are most important for the better educated and the businessman.
- \* Radio is relaxing as a soothing musical background and can provide news most quickly. In a public emergency, people would turn to their radios first. Normally, it is considered the most suitable medium for housewives and teenagers.
- \* Magazines are regarded as the least essential of the mass media. Like newspapers, they demand time and concentration and they are a private, not a family, medium.
- \* If Canadians had to choose between losing their television, radio or newspaper for a week, slightly more would be reluctant to give up their television than radio or newspaper. However, if the time period was extended to one year concern for losing the newspaper increases. College-educated people are most concerned about losing a newspaper.
- \* More than half of Canadians believe that newspapers represent the interest of the public at large. This attitude varies by regions.
- \* Television is identified by more people than either newspapers or radio as being the most factual, influential, educational, open, and frank, the most personal, and the one in which the family gets most interested. At the same time, more people consider newspapers and radio to be the most essential media. Even though television seems to satisfy more needs, people continue to have a strong identification with the older media.
- \* In the prairie provinces, radio is perceived to be the most essential medium. This is probably related to the fact that in Saskatchewan and other areas of the West fewer householders have access to a daily newspaper. In Ontario and English-speaking Quebec, newspapers are most essential. In the Maritimes, newspapers and radio rank equally.
- \* Farmers are more involved with radio than are people in urban centres.
- \* Most Canadians feel they are better informed today than they were five years ago. They believe competition among the media has made for better reporting.
- \* Expressions of dissatisfaction with radio are less intense than with television. This is probably related to the degree of involvement with the medium.
- \* Newspapers offer freedom of choice. This is a key advantage. The reader can choose what he likes to read and reject what he does not like. Newspapers serve to clear people's thinking on issues or ideas.
- \* Newspapers are not criticized for advertising content. Advertising in newspapers is regarded as a type of information. Criticism of newspapers centres on a belief that they tend to be sensational.
- \* About half of the people fear the possibility of newspapers invading their privacy. Television and radio are not feared for this reason.
- \* Canadians believe that the media have the ability to influence their thinking and their way of life. Television is identified as the most influential. About one in

two Canadians suspect that television and magazines may contribute to a breakdown in moral standards and disrespect for religion. Fewer say this about newspapers and none say it of radio.

- \* Canadians believe the media have been a strong influence in promoting a desire for education. Television and radio are singled out as more influential in the growth of divorce, student protests, the use of drugs and Canadian nationalism. Newspapers, more than television and radio, are believed to contribute to a poor image for the labour movement.
- \* Newspapers are regarded as the conscience of society by 65% of the people, television by 53%, radio by 49%, magazines by 44%. Television is the medium most often regarded as contributing to a strong family relationship. Newspapers and television are especially credited with reminding people of their responsibilities to the less fortunate. However, all media are considered to do a good job.
- \* Newspapers are regarded as a medium for all people in all age groups and of different education levels. They are described as containing something for everyone. Radio is also for everyone but is generally perceived as a lower intelligence medium.
- \* Two out of three Canadians believe that a television camera can distort the truth. However, most people (seven in ten) are not concerned about this. They have faith in the integrity of the television operators.
- \* Eight in ten Canadians say that television is the best place for children under ten to acquire information.
- \* More than four in ten Canadians admit that they talk to their radios or television sets. This is partly from loneliness and partly from a latent frustration at not being able to react to what is said, or done on the screen.
- \* People believe that television has the greatest influence on their attitudes towards travel, sex, love, marriage, family, political enthusiasm, clothes styles, student movements, personal habits, and profanity. Newspapers are regarded as most influential in attitudes toward law, the courts, security, the economic system, school systems, religion, birth control, divorce, Canadian nationalism. In attitudes towards money matters and strikes, the influence of television and newspapers tends to be equal.
- \* There is a belief that the media attempt to improve understanding of French-Canadian aspirations. However, a majority of people in the four western provinces say that the media generate resentment rather than better understanding. Most French Canadians believe that understanding is improved. In Ontario and English speaking Quebec, opinion is nearly equally divided.
- \* Newspapers are chosen by 74% as the medium that best performs the role of ombudsman or public protector. Television is identified by 25% and radio by 22%.
- \* Canadians generally believe that the media have been fair to the police.

## GENERAL SUMMARY

### MEDIA USE

#### *Daily Use*

Over eight in ten Canadians fifteen years of age and over claim to look at and/or listen to TV, radio, and newspapers each day. Magazines are read daily by only two in ten, perhaps not surprising as they are less frequently issued.

	Per cent of individuals aged 15 years and over in Canada
Use more than one medium daily. .	89
Use only one daily . . . . .	11
<i>Media Used Daily</i>	
Television . . . . .	91
Radio . . . . .	89
Newspapers . . . . .	88
Magazines . . . . .	23

(See Tables 7 and 8)

#### *TV in Home*

Although only 86% of Canadians claimed to use their TV sets daily, 96% have at least one set in their homes. One-third say they have more than one TV available.

One-fifth of the homes with TV are on cable.

	Per cent of individuals
<i>Number of Televisions in Home</i>	
None . . . . .	4
One . . . . .	63
Two . . . . .	28
Three or more . . . . .	5
Television is on Cable . . . . .	20

(See Tables 77 and 78)

#### *Radios in Home*

While 83% of those over fifteen years of age respond that they listen to the radio daily, virtually every home in Canada has a minimum of one radio set. On the average, there are over two radio sets per home in Canada.

	Per cent of individuals
<i>Number of Radio Sets in Home</i>	
None . . . . .	2
One . . . . .	26
Two . . . . .	30
Three . . . . .	21
Four or more . . . . .	21
Average number in Canadian homes . . . . .	2.33

(See Table 76)

### Newspapers Received in Home

In Canada, 87% of homes receive a daily newspaper and 80% claim to read newspapers daily. Just over one-fifth have more than one daily newspaper come into the home daily.

	Per cent of individuals
<i>Number of Newspapers Received Daily</i>	
None . . . . .	13
One . . . . .	66
Two . . . . .	17
Three or more . . . . .	4

(See Table 75)

### Sub-Group Variations

Those in Ontario and English-speaking Quebec are most likely to receive a daily newspaper. Ontario residents are more likely to read at least one daily.

People living in Saskatchewan are the least likely to purchase a daily newspaper, and it follows that daily readership is also lowest here. Those in French Quebec are just as unlikely to read a newspaper each day, although they are more likely than Saskatchewan residents to have access to one.

Newspapers are more likely to be read by college-educated people than those of less education, and much more commonly read by them.

	Per cent of individuals	
	Receive at least one newspaper daily	Read at least one newspaper daily
Total Canada . . . . .	88	80
Region		
British Columbia . . . . .	90	82
Alberta . . . . .	93	84
Saskatchewan . . . . .	76	65
Manitoba . . . . .	83	78
Ontario . . . . .	92	86
Quebec English . . . . .	91	79
Quebec French . . . . .	81	66
New Brunswick . . . . .	88	77
Nova Scotia . . . . .	89	85
Prince Edward Island*		
Newfoundland . . . . .	93	82
Education		
High school or less . . . . .	87	76
College education . . . . .	93	88

\*Base too small to be meaningful  
(See Tables 8 and 75)

## News Magazines Received

Nearly four in ten Canadians over age fifteen receive a news magazine. Just over half of these people read *Time*.

	Per cent of individuals
Receive a news magazine . . . . .	39
Magazines Read	
<i>Time</i> . . . . .	20
Newsweek . . . . .	3
Other . . . . .	11
Did not state . . . . .	5

(See Tables 34 and 35)

## Sub-Group Variations

Likelihood of receiving a news magazine increases with education and increased annual income, and decreases with age. Nearly four in ten who have a university degree or who have incomes in excess of \$12,000 per annum read *Time*. Nearly three in ten aged fifteen to twenty years also claim to receive it.

	Per cent of individuals who	
	Receive a news magazine	Receive <i>Time</i>
Total Canada . . . . .	39	20
Education		
High school or less . . .	34	15
College education . . .	57	36
Income		
Under \$4,000 . . . . .	31	11
\$4,001 - \$6,000 . . . .	30	11
\$6,001 - \$8,000 . . . .	34	16
\$8,001 - \$10,000 . . .	40	23
\$10,001 - \$12,000 . .	45	30
Over \$12,000 . . . . .	62	38
Age		
15 - 20 years . . . . .	50	28
20 - 24 years . . . . .	37	23
25 - 44 years . . . . .	38	19
Over 44 years . . . . .	36	17

(See Tables 34 and 35)

## Daily Newspaper Reading Time

On the average, Canadians claim to spend just over forty minutes each day reading a newspaper.

Men and women say they give six or seven minutes to each of the front page, international news, and editorials. Men read more of the sports section than women (seven minutes versus three minutes) while women spend more time with the Women's Section (seven versus two minutes).



About half as much time is spent reading the want ads and the travel and financial sections. Men spend longer than women with finance.

	Average Amount of Time Spent Reading in Minutes		
	Total Canadians	Men	Women
Newspaper Sections			
Front page . . . . .	7	7	6
International news . . . . .	7	7	6
Editorials . . . . .	6	6	6
Sports . . . . .	5	7	3
Women's section . . . . .	5	2	7
Want ads . . . . .	4	4	4
Travel . . . . .	3	3	3
Financial section . . . . .	3	4	2
Other . . . . .	4	4	4
Total Time: . . . . .	44	44	41

(See Table 32)

MEDIA AS NEWS PURVEYORS

Information

Nearly nine in ten feel they are better informed today than five years ago.

	Per cent of individuals
Compared to Five Years Ago	
Feel better informed . . . . .	86
Do not feel better informed . . .	13
Did not state . . . . .	1

(See Table 14)

News Balance

Just over seven in ten claim to be satisfied with the balance of international, national, and local news that they receive. Although almost this number say they would like the same amount of news each day as they currently receive, about three in ten desire more.

	Per cent of individuals
Feel balance of international national and local news	
Is good . . . . .	72
Is not good . . . . .	18
Amount of daily news desired	
More . . . . .	29
Same as now . . . . .	68
Less . . . . .	2

(See Tables 30 and 68)

*Local, National, International News*

About half of Canadian adults feel they are most interested in and most inclined to trust local news rather than national and international. However, more people are inclined to want an increase in national than local, or international news.

	Per cent of individuals		
	Most interested in	Trust Most	Would like to see more of
News Categories			
Local . . . . .	43	46	30
International . . .	32	26	29
National . . . . .	22	24	35
Did not state . . .	3	4	6

(See Table 30)

*Medium for News Categories*

Newspapers and radio are rated as the most important and believable media for local news. TV is clearly seen as best for national and particularly international news.

	Per cent of Individuals stating of		
	Local News	Inter-national News	National News
Most Important Medium			
Television . . . . .	25	56	48
Newspapers . . . . .	39	24	29
Radio . . . . .	33	12	19
Magazines . . . . .	—	6	2
Did not state . . . . .	3	2	2
Most Believable Medium			
Television . . . . .	24	60	52
Newspapers . . . . .	39	19	26
Radio . . . . .	33	11	17
Magazines . . . . .	—	8	2
Did not state . . . . .	4	2	3

(See Tables 3 and 4)

*News Presentation*

Over 80% feel strongly that the news should be simple, factual, easy to understand, and unsophisticated. A majority state that obtaining information should not require effort, and that stories should be happy without too many gory details.



	Per cent of individuals who	
	Agree strongly	Disagree strongly
News Presentations		
News should be simple and factual . . . . .	87	2
News should be unsophisticated and easy to understand . . . . .	83	3
Information should be acquired with least possible effort . . . . .	66	9
Stories should be happy . . . . .	62	7
Stories should include all gory details . . . . .	15	57

(See Table 54)

### *News and Programme Sources*

The participants were asked which medium — TV, newspapers, radio and/or magazines — they use for facts, background, interpretation, special reports, entertainment, and relaxation. They could claim to use more than one medium for each.

Clearly newspapers and TV are supported more than radio and magazines as news sources. Newspapers are preferred to TV for facts, background, and interpretation. However, TV clearly is the favourite medium for special reports. For special reports, radio receives more support than newspapers, perhaps because of its immediacy.

TV is the most popular entertainment and relaxation medium, although radio challenges it somewhat for relaxation time.

	Per cent of individuals who use for					
	Facts	Back-ground	Inter-pretation	Special Reports	Entertainment	Relaxation
Medium Used						
Television . . . . .	34	27	37	62	81	68
Newspapers . . . . .	47	43	41	13	10	6
Radio . . . . .	18	14	13	25	12	24
Magazines . . . . .	10	18	12	7	3	7

(See Table 36)

## CONTENT

### *Sensationalism*

When asked which medium — TV, radio or newspapers — is the most sensational, TV is clearly indicated.

	Per cent of individuals selecting as most sensational
Medium	
Television . . . . .	81
Newspapers . . . . .	14
Radio . . . . .	4
Did not state . . . . .	1

(See Table 62)

### *Four-letter Words*

Fewer than 20% of Canadians feel that four-letter words should be allowed in any of the print or broadcast media.

	Per cent of individuals Feeling Four-letter words should be allowed
On Medium	
Television . . . . .	12
Newspapers . . . . .	14
Radio . . . . .	11
Magazines . . . . .	17

(See Table 65)

### *Canadian Versus American Media*

Canadians come out strongly in favour of their own newspapers, radio, and magazines. However, they prefer American TV stations and particularly American programmes to those produced in Canada.

	Per cent of individuals stating	
	Prefer Canadian	Prefer U.S.
Medium		
Television . . . . .	43	54
Newspapers . . . . .	94	2
Radio . . . . .	92	4
Magazines . . . . .	56	37
On Television		
Shows . . . . .	35	60

(See Table 63)

## *Media Human Relations*

Just over three-quarters of Canadians believe the media develop amicable relations with the United States, and about half feel they increase an understanding of French-Canadian desires but 43% believe they have the opposite effect.

	Per cent of individuals
Canadian media create	
Friendship with U.S. . . . .	77
Animosity or bad feelings . . . . .	18
Did not state . . . . .	5
Understanding of French-	
Canadian desires . . . . .	52
Resentment towards French-	
Canadian desires . . . . .	43
Did not state . . . . .	5

(See Table 66)

## *Effect on Way of Life*

Nearly nine in ten believe the media have the power to affect our way of life. Of these people, two-thirds state that TV has the greatest effect. Newspapers are the only other medium seen to affect Canadian lives substantially.

	Per cent of Individuals
Feel media can affect people's thinking or way of life . . . . .	89
Media which affect most	
Television . . . . .	59
Newspapers . . . . .	25
Radio . . . . .	3
Magazines . . . . .	2
Feel media cannot affect people's thinking or way of life . . . . .	11

(See Tables 18 and 19)

## *Attitudes Influenced by Media*

Each respondent was asked to think about TV, newspapers and radio and to decide whether a number of social attitudes had been influenced by any or all of them. It should be noted that the influence of the media in each of these areas could be positive or negative.

In agreement with the previous general assessment of the effect of the media on our way of life, generally for each category TV is rated most influential, newspapers less influential, and radio the least influential.

The media are thought to have been particularly influential in increasing a desire for education and affecting student protests. By a substantial proportion, they are also believed to have had an impact on Canadian nationalism and increased drug addiction.

TV, considerably more than newspapers or radio, is identified as affecting the amount of smoking by young people. Newspapers are most often identified as contributing to labour's poor image. None of these media is thought to have influenced divorce strongly.

Radio, although less influential than TV and newspapers, is credited by over half of Canadians with increasing a desire for education, encouraging student protests and influencing Canadian nationalism.

	Per cent of individuals who feel media have affected people's thinking		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
<b>Attitudes Affected</b>			
Increase in desire for education . . . . .	85	77	65
Student protests . . . . .	80	72	52
Smoking by young people . . . . .	72	40	31
Canadian nationalism . . . . .	64	66	51
Increase in drug addiction . . . . .	61	51	28
Labour's poor image . . . . .	52	59	37
Divorce . . . . .	47	39	19

(See Table 26)

### *Subject Matter and Source*

Respondents were asked whether they were getting enough information on a series of topics and where they were getting their best information about each. At least three-quarters feel they have sufficient information concerning places to shop and Canadian politics. About two-thirds feel similarly about consumer goods, national unity, Canadian labour and taxes. Just better than half were satisfied with their amount of data concerning Canadian economics and changes in law.

For each of these topics, newspapers were selected far more often than either TV or radio as the best source of information. TV received its greatest support – by just over a third of the people – as an information source about Canadian politics, consumer goods and national unity.

	Per cent of individuals			
	Feel getting enough information on	Get best information from		
		Television	Newspapers	Radio
Subject Areas				
Places to shop . . . . .	82	21	63	13
Canadian Politics . . . . .	74	38	51	7
Consumer Goods . . . . .	66	37	48	11
National Unity . . . . .	62	35	51	7
Canadian Labour . . . . .	62	23	62	9
Taxes . . . . .	60	21	67	7
Canadian Economics . . . . .	56	23	63	8
Changes in Law . . . . .	52	23	62	9

(See Table 56)

## Specific News Stories

Respondents were asked whether they felt well informed, somewhat informed, inadequately informed or poorly informed on a number of specific news stories. The table below shows the percent claiming to be well informed and somewhat informed and then these two ratings totalled.

It should be noted that some of the stories are international and others national. The national stories – the British Columbia election and the Stafford Smythe case – are obviously of greater interest in those areas in which they originated. At the time of interviewing, the first moon landing and the British Columbia election had just happened and the Arab-Israeli conflict was very active. The Stafford Smythe story had come to light a few months before. The other stories are on-going issues.

More than 90% felt well informed about the moon landing. (The tremendous success of this programme may have had some bearing on the high rating of television as best for “special features.”)

Considerably less than half the people felt well informed on every other issue. However, the “somewhat informed” rating indicates a generally high awareness of each, except in the case of the Stafford Smythe incident with the Toronto Maple Leafs.

	Per cent of individuals feeling		
	Well Informed about	Somewhat Informed about	Total Well Somewhat
News Stories			
Moon landing . . . . .	91	7	98
Separatism . . . . .	41	35	76
Arab-Israeli conflict . . . . .	39	34	73
Homosexual bill . . . . .	33	36	69
National Medicare Scheme . . . . .	30	31	61
B. C. Election . . . . .	25	32	57
Language Bill . . . . .	23	38	61
Stafford Smythe case . . . . .	10	24	34

(See Table 21)

## Influence on Life

Each individual was read a list of twenty-two factors which are a part of or affect his life. He was asked of each whether he felt TV, radio, or newspapers had most influenced his attitudes towards them or his habits in relation to them.

The chart below shows graphically the proportion of people selecting each medium – TV, newspapers and radio – for each item. Combined with the proportion who did not state an answer (perhaps because they felt unaffected by these media), 100% of respondents are accounted for.

Radio, as we have seen before, is not seen as a powerful directive, except perhaps in the case of religion. Possibly the number of religious programmes on radio has gained it this support.



The relative influence of TV and newspapers in each subject area becomes obvious if it is remembered that TV can offer excitement through moving pictures, and that it is seen as a relaxing entertainment medium while newspapers, on the other hand, are viewed as the detailed news medium necessary for explanation of more complex issues. Thus, TV is most particularly influential in matters of a family or social nature: love, sex, travel, family and marriage. Just over half of Canadians also select it as the most powerful medium for affecting profanity, student movements, clothes fads and styles, personal habits and political fever.

Attitudes towards strikes and money are reported to be about equally affected by television and newspapers.

Newspapers take over as the most influential in areas requiring specific, detailed knowledge for greater understanding: courts, law, economic and school systems, divorce, birth control, money, security and Canadian nationalism. (TV may fare relatively poorly in its perceived ability to affect Canadian nationalism because it is recognised to carry many American programmes.)

### *Influence of Media Again*

Each person was asked whether he agreed strongly, agreed somewhat or disagreed with a number of statements about the content and effect of the media. The statements were all changed in turn to refer to radio, newspapers, magazines, and television.

Most of the statements were negative; for example, "Radio has too much sex in it." Disagreement with the statement was good for that medium. The negative statements are discussed in this section, the positive in the next.

The chart below shows the proportion disagreeing with each negative statement. Hence, the greater the disagreement, the more favourable the rating for that medium.

Radio receives much less criticism than the other media for emphasizing sex, violence and drugs, for contributing to moral breakdown, for creating disrespect for religion, for contributing to the belief that Canada will break apart, and for making divorce seem acceptable.

Newspapers fare second best, except in their promotion of Canadian unity. There is some concern that newspapers contain too much violence and make divorce seem right.

Over half the people feel TV contributes to moral breakdown and lends its approval to divorce, perhaps because they feel it shows too much sex, violence, and drugs.

A majority of people think magazines are not giving the impression that Canada will break apart. However, they are criticized for causing moral breakdown, disrespect of religion, and making divorce more acceptable. They are noted particularly as having too much sex.

### *Effect of Media*

This section discusses four positive attributes of the media that were asked about. The table shows the percent agreeing strongly, agreeing somewhat, and disagreeing.

Although there is fairly general agreement that the mass media do remind people of their social responsibilities and are concerned about social problems, Canadians do not seem strong in their support. Almost half agree only somewhat. Magazines are the most criticized for not making people conscious of their responsibilities to others and radio the most for not being concerned about social problems. Newspapers are thought to be most concerned about social problems.

Nearly one-half do not see radio, TV and magazines as society's conscience, while about two-thirds say newspapers are.

Only TV convinces a majority of people that it helps to build a strong family relationship.

	Per cent of individuals who		
	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree
Statements:			
Remind people of responsibilities to less fortunate:			
Radio . . . . .	29	47	22
Newspapers . . . . .	33	46	20
Television . . . . .	35	43	20
Magazines . . . . .	18	47	29
Tend to be concerned about social problems:			
Radio . . . . .	25	48	24
Newspapers . . . . .	33	49	17
Television . . . . .	29	48	22
Magazines . . . . .	28	46	20
Are society's conscience:			
Radio . . . . .	11	38	49
Newspapers . . . . .	22	43	34
Television . . . . .	15	38	46
Magazines . . . . .	10	34	49
Contribute to strong family relationship:			
Radio . . . . .	10	37	50
Newspapers . . . . .	10	31	58
Television . . . . .	17	37	44
Magazines . . . . .	7	31	56

(See Table 28)

## VIOLENCE, SEX, LOVE, AND DRUGS

### *Love Versus Violence in Print*

Seven in ten claim to prefer reading of love rather than violence.

	Per cent of individuals
Prefer to read about . . .	
Love . . . . .	70
Violence . . . . .	18
Did not state . . . . .	12

(See Table 49)



*Fighting on TV*

When asked if they get satisfaction from seeing fighting on TV (such as cowboys or hockey players), just over four in ten claimed to do so. (It has been suggested that seeing others involved in violent outbursts can satisfy one's own urge to "blow up.")

	Per cent of individuals
Get satisfaction from fighting . . . . .	41
Do not get satisfaction . . . . .	58
Did not state . . . . .	1

(See Table 49)

*Violence, Sex and Drugs on Media*

Three-quarters of the people feel too much violence is shown on television, two-thirds feel there is too much sex and better than half believe there are too many programmes on drug usage. TV is more criticized than newspapers and particularly than radio.

However, more than half claim that the newspapers portray too much violence. More than 40% also state there are too many articles on sex and drug usage in the newspapers.

	Per cent of individuals feeling too much in each		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
Subjects			
Violence . . . . .	78	56	25
Sex . . . . .	66	41	18
Drug Usage . . . . .	54	45	21

(See Table 27)

*Violence on Television and Moral Breakdown*

Respondents were asked of a number of violent and sexual situations whether they should be shown on television and whether, if shown, they would contribute to the moral breakdown of society.

Violence is considered acceptable in some situations, unacceptable in others. "Suitable" subjects seem to be those which do not infringe the law or intrude on privacy: hockey game fighting, pie-throwing and war stories. "Unsuitable" subjects

tend to be disturbing situations related to youth and family life: glue sniffing, nudity, mother and father fighting, student riots.

	Per cent of individuals feeling	
	Should be shown on television	If shown, would contribute to moral breakdown
Subject Matter		
Funerals . . . . .	71	18
Pie-throwing cartoons . . . . .	69	13
Hockey game fights . . . . .	63	31
War stories . . . . .	60	35
Men throwing pies . . . . .	53	25
Players disobeying referee . . .	49	45
A live assassination . . . . .	34	61
Students rioting . . . . .	30	71
Man and woman making love .	28	62
Mother and father fighting . .	28	67
Boy fighting policeman . . . .	19	75
Nudity . . . . .	15	72
Somebody sniffing glue . . . .	10	82

(See Table 45)

## POLITICAL PRESS COVERAGE

### *Government Information Sources*

The fact that 60% of Canadians feel the government should rely entirely on the media to report its proceedings suggests the majority of people are satisfied with the functioning of the media in this regard. The remainder say there is a need for the government to inform Canadians independently.

	Per cent of individuals
Government Information Sources	
Should rely on media totally . . . . .	60
Government should inform independently . . . . .	37
Did not state . . . . .	3

(See Table 22)

### *Media Criticism of Government*

The satisfaction of the people with the media's reporting of government activities is perhaps supported by the fact that over 50% claim the media are "doing a good job" of criticizing the government. Those not satisfied tend to think that they are not critical enough rather than too critical.

	Per cent of individuals
Feel Media	
Too critical of government . . . . .	15
Doing a good job . . . . .	54
Not critical enough . . . . .	29
Did not state . . . . .	2
Net difference	
Too Critical/Not Critical Enough . . .	-14

(See table 69)

### *Media as Critics*

Newspapers are seen as considerably more critical of the government than are TV and radio.

	Per cent of individuals
Most Critical Medium	
Television . . . . .	20
Newspapers . . . . .	68
Radio . . . . .	8
Did not state . . . . .	4

(See Table 69)

### *Trudeau and Stanfield, the NDP*

People are inclined to think that the press coverage of Mr. Trudeau has been less fair than coverage of Mr. Stanfield or of the NDP. Few, however, feel that there has been any great unfairness.

	Per cent of individuals stating of . . .		
	Mr. Trudeau	Mr. Stanfield	the NDP
Treatment By "Press"			
Very fair . . . . .	29	38	35
Somewhat fair . . . . .	48	36	31
Not at all fair . . . . .	13	10	12
Other . . . . .	7	10	11
Did not state . . . . .	3	6	11

(See Table 16)

### *Reporting of Private Lives*

More than three-quarters of Canadians feel that the private lives of elected politicians are their own business and should not be reported.

	Per cent of individuals
Feel Private Lives of Politicians	
Should be reported . . . . .	22
Should not be reported . . . . .	77
Did not state . . . . .	1

(See Table 17)

## *Invasion of Privacy*

They were next asked if the press had invaded the private lives of Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Stanfield. There was strong agreement that Mr. Trudeau's privacy had been invaded while Mr. Stanfield's had not. The majority of people accused the newspapers of this invasion.

	Per cent of individuals stating of	
	Mr. Trudeau	Mr. Stanfield
Feel "Press"		
Has invaded private life . . . .	75	9
Has not invaded private life . .	24	85
Did not state . . . . .	1	6
Medium Most Unfair in Invading Private Life		
Newspapers . . . . .	62	26
Television . . . . .	11	6
Magazines . . . . .	9	6
Radio . . . . .	2	1
Did not state . . . . .	16	61

(See Table 17)

## *Reporting of Politicians*

Only about one in five Canadians believe they are getting unbiased reporting of the activities of politicians.

	Per cent of individuals
Coverage of Politicians	
Very biased . . . . .	15
Somewhat biased . . . . .	60
Not biased . . . . .	21
Did not state . . . . .	4

(See Table 25)

## CONTROL/CENSORSHIP

### *Freedom of the Press*

One Canadian in five thinks the press has too much freedom. Most Canadians disagree.

	Per cent of individuals
Freedom of Media	
Too much . . . . .	22
Not too much . . . . .	76
Did not state . . . . .	2

(See Table 67)

*Necessity of Censorship*

Three-quarters state that at least some censorship is necessary for TV. About half feel similarly about newspapers and radio.

	Per cent of individuals
Believe Censorship necessary for	
Television . . . . .	76
Newspapers . . . . .	49
Radio . . . . .	49

(See Table 59)

*Government Control*

It was explained that the government (through the Canadian Radio-Television Commission) regulates TV and radio but has no system of control over newspapers. The people were asked if this control over TV and radio should cease and whether the government should also control newspapers.

One-third feel the government should cease its control over broadcasting. One-fifth think the government should control newspapers.

	Per cent of individuals
Government control over media	
Should cease with television . . . . .	33
Should cease with radio . . . . .	33
Should also control newspapers . . .	19

(See Table 73)

*Controlled News*

Nearly 70% believe that news in the press is subject to some form of exterior control. (Note: Early in the interview, it was explained that the term “press” was intended to include all information media; nevertheless it is probable that some respondents continued to think primarily of the print media.)

	Per cent of individuals
News in “press” is	
Controlled . . . . .	69
Real . . . . .	29
Did not state . . . . .	2

(See Table 31)

*Those Influencing News*

At various times during the interview, respondents were asked if the government, advertisers, and criminal elements affected the news.

Nearly half feel the government influences what a publisher prints, but only one-fifth think it should have this power. One-third are of the opinion that



advertisers influence news content. Just over four in ten suspect that criminal elements influence the press.

	Per cent of individuals supporting each
Statements	
Government influences what the press publishes . . . . .	46
Government should influence what press publishes . . . . .	43
Advertisers controls content of news .	33
Criminal elements influence the press	42

(See Tables 10, 11, 13 and 47)

### *Press Bias*

Separately, the participants selected those influences which they felt biased the press.

Nearly two-thirds of Canadians suspect big business and over half suspect the federal government of biasing the media. Local government and criminal elements are considered influential by about four in ten. Only one-third think the police have an effect.

	Per cent of individuals each as a factor causing "press" bias
Factors	
Big business . . . . .	65
Federal government . . . . .	52
Local government . . . . .	44
Criminal elements . . . . .	38
Federal police . . . . .	33
Local police . . . . .	32

(See Table 12)

### *Interests Represented by Media*

Despite this predominant feeling that big business and the federal government bias the press, about six in ten state that newspapers represent the interests of the public at large, three in ten the advertiser, and one in ten the government in power.

	Per cent of individuals selecting as most true
The newspaper you read represents the interests of	
The public at large . . . . .	57
The advertisers . . . . .	29
The government in power . . . . .	11
Did not state . . . . .	3

(See Table 24)

## OWNERSHIP

### *Knowledge of Local Owners*

Canadians are relatively unlikely to know the name of the owner of their local newspaper, TV, or radio stations and are even less likely to want to know. About four in ten claim to know the owner of the newspaper and television station and just better than three in ten the radio station. Approximately three in ten say they are interested in knowing the owners. (It would seem likely that these interested persons are those who already know.)

	Per cent of individuals stating of each		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
Know who owns local medium . . . . .	39	42	32
Interested to know who owns local medium . .	29	32	30

(See Table 71)

### *Political Affiliation of Local Media*

Canadians are even less likely to know the political affiliation of the local media than they are the owners. About one-third claim to know the leaning of their newspaper, but just over 10% knew this of their local broadcasting stations (perhaps because broadcasters editorialize politically less).

	Per cent of individuals stating of each		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
Know political affiliation of local medium . . . .	13	32	12
Feel influenced by their political position . . . .	19	21	14

(See Table 71)

### *Foreign Ownership*

About three-quarters of Canadians state that foreign ownership of the media concerns them. However, if asked to select the most acceptable foreign owners, they are most likely to favour Americans. The British are seen as the next most acceptable.

	Per cent of individuals stating of each		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
Feel it matters if foreigners own medium	74	75	75
Most acceptable foreigners			
U.S. . . . .	56	46	51
Britain . . . . .	24	32	27
France . . . . .	7	7	7
Other . . . . .	7	15	7

(See Table 52)

## Ownership Situations

Each person was asked to agree or disagree strongly or somewhat with a number of statements describing ownership situations. The table below shows the percent who agreed and disagreed with each.

In summary, it would seem that the people are strongly opposed to multi-media ownership in a local area but not so much against multi-media ownership scattered throughout the country. Cross-media ownership is disliked by about 60%.

	Per cent of individuals stating	
	Agreement	Disagreement
Local concentration of ownership		
One company should be allowed to own most newspapers in one area . .	19	80
One person or company should be allowed to own TV and radio stations and newspapers in a local area . . . .	31	68
Broadcast stations should be owned by local citizens. There should not be absentee owners . . . . .	64	34
Cross-media ownership		
No company should be allowed to have controlling interest of companies in more than one medium . . . .	59	40
Multi-media ownership in all parts of country		
One company should not be allowed to own		
TV stations . . . . .	45	54
Radio stations . . . . .	46	53
Newspapers . . . . .	53	46

(See Table 53)

## ADVERTISING

### *Its Role*

Over 80% of Canadians credit advertising with having a positive role to play.

	Per cent of individuals
Advertising	
Has a positive role . . . . .	84
Does not have a positive role . . . . .	14
Did not state . . . . .	2

(See Table 47)

*Influence of Advertising*

About as many people admit to being at least somewhat influenced by advertising as say that they are not at all influenced or fight it.

	Per cent of individuals	
Influenced by Advertising		
A great deal . . . . .	10	} 38
Somewhat . . . . .	28	
A little . . . . .	27	} 35
Not at all . . . . .	25	
I fight it . . . . .	10	

(See Table 47)

*School System Versus Advertising*

While over 50% are of the opinion that the Canadian school system influences society more than advertising, over 40% are of the opposite opinion.

	Per cent of individuals
Society most influenced by	
School system . . . . .	54
Advertising . . . . .	42
Did not state . . . . .	4

(See Table 60)

*Media Advertising Influence*

There is strong agreement (63%) that TV commercials are the most likely to influence people. About one-quarter feel newspaper advertisements are more effective.

	Per cent of individuals
Media advertising which influences most	
Television . . . . .	63
Newspapers . . . . .	25
Radio . . . . .	3
Did not state . . . . .	9

(See Table 47)

*Influence to Purchase*

Approximately 60% feel they are more likely to be stimulated to purchase by advertisements they like, rather than dislike, and remember. (Researchers' Note: While this has been generally proven to be true, in some cases disliked commercials have been very effective sales catalysts.)

	Per cent of individuals claiming to be most influenced to purchase
<hr/>	
Advertisements	
Liked and remembered . . . . .	61
Disliked and remembered . . . . .	5
Both equally . . . . .	29
Did not state . . . . .	5
<hr/>	
(See Table 47)	

### *Advertising as an Art*

Over seven in ten think advertising is an art form.

	Per cent of individuals
<hr/>	
Advertising	
Is an art form . . . . .	72
Is not an art form . . . . .	14
Did not state . . . . .	14
<hr/>	
(See Table 47)	

### *Advertising Types Liked Best*

About two-thirds say they like humorous advertisements best, while nearly one-third prefer those giving the facts only. Suspense themes and other forms receive little acclaim.

	Per cent of individuals liking best
<hr/>	
Type of Advertisements	
Humour . . . . .	62
Facts only . . . . .	31
Suspense . . . . .	4
Other . . . . .	2
Did not state . . . . .	1
<hr/>	
(See Table 47)	

### *Newspaper Advertisements as News*

People are divided about equally in their judgment as to whether newspaper advertisements can sometimes be called news.

	Per cent of individuals
<hr/>	
Advertisements in Newspaper	
Sometimes news . . . . .	51
Never news . . . . .	48
Did not state . . . . .	1
<hr/>	
(See Table 47)	



*Preference for Television Commercials Over Programmes*

While one-third think that TV commercials are sometimes more interesting than the programme within which they are shown, two-thirds say this is never so.

	Per cent of individuals
Advertisements on Television	
Sometimes more interesting than programmes . . . . .	33
Never more interesting than programmes . . . . .	66
Did not state . . . . .	1

(See Table 47)

*Commercials in Television Movies*

Almost all Canadians support the idea of controlling the number of commercials in TV movies.

	Per cent of individuals
Advertisements in Movies on Television	
Number should be controlled . . . . .	92
Number should not be controlled . . . . .	7
Did not state . . . . .	1

(See Table 47)

*Products Suited for Advertising*

Although people feel advertising has a positive role, they do not feel all products should be advertised. Over half the people state that advertising of sleeping pills, cigarettes, liquor, and glue should be banned. However, beer and wine are relatively more acceptable and soft drinks and gasoline unobjectionable.

	Per cent of individuals stating each should be banned in advertising
Articles	
Sleeping pills . .	66
Cigarettes . . . .	60
Liquor . . . . .	55
Glue . . . . .	52
Beer . . . . .	39
Wine . . . . .	35
Soft Drinks . . .	16
Gasoline . . . . .	11

(See Table 48)

## IMAGE

On a number of occasions during the interview, the participants were asked to choose the medium which they felt provided the most of a given number of attributes. In some instances the choice involved just newspapers, TV, and radio. In others, magazines were also included. Some of the attributes were repeated in more than one question.

For ease in analysis, the following calculations to this data have been made:

1 The average rating for repeated attributes is given.

2 Those few ratings including magazines have been retabulated to exclude magazines in order to provide a fuller understanding of the images of the three main news and entertainment media: newspapers, TV, and radio.

Later, a comparison of magazines in relation to these other three media is given.

### *Product Attributes*

In this section and those that follow, bar graphs have been used to illustrate the proportion of people selecting either TV or newspapers or radio as the "best" for delivering certain qualities. On the following page the attributes most closely related to the physical limitations and content of each medium are illustrated.

TV would appear to be the most realistic of these media as over eight in ten select it first for showing life as it really is. About six in ten claim it is most educational (perhaps partially because of ETV) and the most likely to make experts available (perhaps because one is more conscious of seeing numbers of faces on TV). TV has a slight edge over newspapers for being the most factual.

Newspapers are strongly favoured over TV for in-depth news reporting; presumably because newspapers can and do provide detailed facts, background and editorialization. Newspapers are thought by about six in ten people to be the best at getting below the surface of the news, digging for truth and all the facts, and telling the whole story.

Radio is a distant third to TV and newspapers for news coverage, particularly in-depth coverage. However, nearly one-quarter feel it is the most factual of these three media.

	Per cent of individuals selecting as best		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
<b>Product Attributes</b>			
Allows you to see life as others live it . . . . .	83	14	2
Most educational . . . . .	60	21	4
Makes experts available . . . . .	56	32	10
Most factual . . . . .	37	28	21
Gets below surface of news . . . . .	31	56	11
Digs for truth, finds out all the facts . . . . .	28	55	13
Tells whole story so not left in air . . . . .	26	60	8

(See Tables 6 and 58)

*Attitudes Towards Products*

This section examines the attitudes towards or impressions of TV, newspapers and radio. Again, one can assume that it is the facilities and content of each medium which affect consumer attitudes.

Almost unanimously, TV is thought of as the most exciting medium. Presumably because it has been shown that moving pictures and sound combined facilitate learning, three-quarters consider it to be the easiest from which to learn. Probably for the same reasons, it is perceived as the most influential by about two-thirds.

Elsewhere in the interview, people have shown some doubt that any of the media are really honest. The lack of consistent agreement in selecting any one medium as the most frank or open in its presentation would seem to bear out this interpretation.

At different times in the interview, respondents were asked which media were "easiest" and "most difficult" as sources of information. It might be expected that the medium most often selected as "easiest" would be least often identified as "most difficult." This, in fact, does not happen. It is suggested that TV is viewed as easiest because it requires little effort to absorb what it illustrates and says. At the same time, it is rated most difficult from which to get information because it does not provide detailed background and analytical fact. Similarly, newspapers are considered least easy because one must take the time to read carefully, but are less criticized for being difficult because the facts are most likely to be there.

Newspapers follow TV, but with considerably less support, for being most influential. They are rated equally with radio and better than television for being most essential.

Radio is clearly voted as the most immediate medium. Six in ten feel things happen fastest through radio coverage.

	Per cent of individuals selecting as best		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
Attitudes Towards Products			
Most exciting . . . . .	92	3	4
Easiest to learn from . . . . .	75	19	5
Most influential . . . . .	66	27	9
Easiest to get information from . . . . .	51	11	35
Most open and frank in its presentation . . . . .	39	26	21
Most difficult to acquire information from . . . . .	28	23	21
Most immediate . . . . .	37	44	59
Most essential . . . . .	25	36	36

(See Tables 6, 15, 42 and 58)

*Effect on Consumer*

On three closely related factors, TV is selected first by about six in ten. TV, it is stated, lets you forget and is most relaxing. Apparently, one can appreciate TV and become absorbed in it without exerting much energy.

It is radio, not newspapers, which offer the next greatest amount of relaxation. (Radio is considered to be a soothing background.) However, radio does not leave many satisfied, presumably because radio does not teach well nor provide as much fact.

Newspapers are voted as making you think most. This seems to explain why they would be rated as least relaxing and second most satisfying.

	Per cent of individuals selecting as best		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
Effect on Consumer			
Lets you forget . . . . .	62	9	27
Is most relaxing . . . . .	61	13	25
Gives sense of satisfaction . . . . .	51	27	18
Makes you think . . . . .	35	53	11

(See Table 58)

### *Social Involvement*

TV is clearly perceived as most suitable for the whole family.

Newspapers tend to be rated as more private than the voice media. However, TV is as likely as newspapers to get you personally involved in its content, although obviously they accomplish this involvement very differently.

	Per cent of individuals selecting as best		
	Television	Newspaper	Radio
Social Involvement			
Most interesting for family . . . . .	79	11	10
Most personally involving . . . . .	41	37	21
Most private . . . . .	19	49	26

(See Tables 6, 42 and 58)

### *User Suitability*

Respondents were asked to rate each of TV, radio, and newspapers on a one to five scale for suitability to various audience groupings. A rating of one indicated the medium was unsuitable for the designated group and five meant it was very suitable. The results are given as a percentage of the total possible score a medium could achieve. In other words, if a medium were rated five (very good) by everyone, it would achieve 100%. If it were rated three by everyone or if it averaged three, it would be shown as 50%.

All three media are scored at about 70% or better for all the types of adults listed: older and middle-aged people, housewives, working and business people. Within these, radio is perceived as best for housewives and newspapers best for business (white collar) people.

Bearing in mind that the people rating the media are at least fifteen years of age, the suitability scores of all three media decline with the user's age. Radio is considered to be best for young people (probably taken as teenagers), and TV for children under ten.

	Per cent who felt media were for		
	Television	Newspapers	Radio
User Suitability			
Older people . . . . .	82	83	79
Middle aged people . .	80	85	80
Housewives . . . . .	77	75	85
Working people . . . . .	76	81	74
Business people . . . . .	69	90	73
Young people . . . . .	65	63	73
Children under 10 . . .	55	30	43

(See Table 50)

*Reluctance to Lose Media*

Each person was asked to select from TV, newspapers and radio, the medium which he would be most reluctant to lose for a week, a month, and a year.

For one week, fewer people are concerned about losing their newspaper than either TV or radio. However, if this time period is extended to a year, it is radio rather than TV or newspapers with which people would be the least reluctant to part.

	Per cent of individuals most reluctant to lose for		
	a week	a month	a year
Media			
Television . . . . .	38	37	35
Newspapers . . . . .	26	26	31
Radio . . . . .	34	29	25
Did not state . . . . .	2	8	9

(See Table 20)

*Magazines Compared for Image*

As mentioned earlier, magazines were included with newspapers, TV and radio in some ratings. In each case, the participant selected the one medium which he considered most effective or most suitable in relation to a specific function.

The graph below is designed to show the proportion of Canadian adults who select each medium for specific attributes. Magazines, newspapers, TV and radio are charted from left to right. This makes it possible to examine magazines in comparison to each of the other media or, by coupling magazines and newspapers, to examine the print media in relation to broadcasting.

Magazines are selected by less than 5% of Canadians as being most influential and essential. Considering this, it is not surprising that magazines are chosen infrequently as “being best for” or “having most of” the other attributes.



However, although chosen in each case less often than newspapers, magazines appear to offer many of the same benefits and have similar limitations. Both are thought to require more concentration and expenditure of energy and are a more difficult source of information than the broadcast media. Print media are also perceived as being more private, less interesting for the whole family and less educational.

	Per cent of individuals selecting as best			
	Magazines	Newspapers	Television	Radio
<i>Attributes</i>				
Concentration of energy . . . . .	25	55	12	7
Most private . . . . .	25	34	15	20
Difficult to acquire information from . .	24	23	28	21
Personally involving . . . . .	15	31	35	18
Most educational . . . . .	13	21	60	4
Most open, frank . . . . .	13	26	39	21
Most factual . . . . .	11	28	37	21
Most influential . . . . .	3	25	59	11
Most essential . . . . .	2	36	25	36
Most interesting for family . . . . .	2	11	77	10
Easiest to get information from . . . . .	2	11	51	35

(See Tables 6 and 15)

### *Emergency Media*

Confirming their support of radio as the most immediate of the media, radio was selected as the medium to turn to in case of a news emergency by three-quarters of the people. Forty percent also felt they would use TV coverage. Almost no one would choose either of the print media, newspapers or magazines.

	Per cent of individuals
<i>Media would turn to in an emergency</i>	
Radio . . . . .	76
Television . . . . .	38
Newspapers . . . . .	7
Magazines . . . . .	—

(See Table 5)

### *Invasion of Privacy*

Nearly one-third of Canadians do not fear that any of the media will invade their privacy. However, 53% of the remaining 79% who fear invasion, say they fear newspapers most. Radio and magazines concern very few, while TV is feared most by about 10%.

	Per cent of individuals who fear most for invasion of privacy
<i>Medium</i>	
Newspapers . . . . .	53
Television . . . . .	11
Radio . . . . .	2
Magazines . . . . .	3
None . . . . .	31

(See Table 17)

## DETAILED TABLES

### THE CONCEPT OF "PRESS"

**Table 1. Meaning of Word "Press" (Question 1)**

% of individuals

Medium or media thought to be "press"	Province*										
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.
							Eng.	Fr.			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
TV .....	19	9	16	16	23	14	19	30	24	24	18
Radio .....	17	9	22	15	21	11	17	23	27	24	31
Newspapers .....	79	85	89	81	82	83	74	67	89	81	80
Magazines .....	8	5	12	6	17	6	11	8	11	6	2
All of these .....	9	5	3	5	5	4	12	25	—	4	12
Other .....	7	10	3	12	8	8	8	4	3	8	4
Does not mean anything ...	2	1	1	—	1	2	1	2	3	1	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 2. Opinion on Press Responsibility (Question 2)**

% of individuals

Press is	Province*										
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.
							Eng.	Fr.			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Very honest in its reporting .....	12	4	10	12	14	9	16	18	22	8	14
Somewhat honest in its reporting ..	46	54	53	49	47	50	50	32	22	61	31
Not really honest in its reporting ..	13	12	11	10	15	13	14	14	24	13	18
Interested in developing interest ...	28	30	22	29	22	27	19	35	30	16	37
Did not state .....	1	—	4	—	2	1	1	1	2	2	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

### BELIEF IN REPORTED NEWS

*Table 3.* For international news, TV is believed to be the most immediate. People can relate to international news better for seeing it on TV because they can see for themselves what is happening. The news, then, becomes in a sense part of their own experience.

"They don't take time to change it. It's as it happens."

"You can see the incident."

"Instant action picture makes it real."

"You see more of what is happening in other countries."

"Television is a more direct way of keeping in touch."

For Canadian news, as for international news, an immediacy of reporting seems to be important to Canadians. Once again, respondents chose TV over the other media. The increase in credibility in newspapers may be partly explained by geography; that is, newspaper reporters within Canada's boundaries are dealing with an audience similarly informed.

"With television you see exactly what did happen."

"Television gives most complete coverage and is easier to follow."

"With television we see what is going on across the country."

"Newspapers have an established system which allows reporters that are here to adequately report what is going on."

"There are more newspaper reporters in Canada."

For local news people tend to go most of all to newspapers. In local matters, people are themselves close to the situation and want the emphasis and detail that newspapers can provide. They want the total information of a newspaper more than the capsulated information of radio or television. This trend is even more obvious in smaller centres where the weekly newspaper becomes a means by which to keep track of friends and acquaintances.

"Newspapers have first-hand knowledge of the news through local reporters."

"Living in the locality, we understand the problem being presented."

"Newspaper gives us more detail about the news that is closest to us."

"They are all old friends in the newspaper."

"For a small town like this you've seen most of the stuff they report about so you can make up your mind if reports are true or not."

Radio to those who prefer it for local news is more immediate in its presentation of news stories. Women tend to have their radios on all day as background to their activities. Hourly news broadcasts are welcome breaks.

"You get hourly reports on radio."

"If something big happens they usually interrupt radio programs and tell us about it. We don't have to wait for it."

# IMPORTANCE OF THE MEDIA FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF NEWS

Table 3. Credibility of Particular Media for International, National, and Local News (Question 3)  
% of individuals

Medium believed most for types of news	Province*												Communi- city		Education		Sex															
	Total		B.C.		Alta.		Sask.		Man.		Ont.		Quebec Eng.		Fr.		N.B.		N.S.		Nfld.		Rural		Urban		High school or less College		Male		Female	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<i>International News</i>																																
Television .....	60	61	53	60	50	57	44	69	70	61	59	55	61	63	47	57	62															
Radio .....	11	11	11	9	15	12	12	8	14	24	8	17	11	11	11	11	12															
Newspapers .....	19	17	25	20	27	21	31	15	16	8	20	21	19	18	23	21	17															
Magazines .....	8	9	10	11	8	9	10	6	—	6	12	5	8	6	17	9	7															
Did not state .....	2	2	1	—	—	1	3	2	—	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2															
<i>Canadian News</i>																																
Television .....	52	54	45	55	50	47	52	59	62	43	67	51	52	53	50	54	51															
Radio .....	17	15	19	17	21	19	11	15	19	33	12	21	17	18	16	16	20															
Newspapers .....	26	26	31	24	25	30	31	22	19	21	18	23	27	26	29	26	26															
Magazines .....	2	2	3	4	2	2	5	2	—	2	2	3	2	2	4	3	2															
Did not state .....	3	3	2	—	2	2	1	2	—	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1															
<i>Local News</i>																																
Television .....	24	19	23	20	17	21	31	35	24	12	25	23	25	26	18	23	25															
Radio .....	33	37	27	46	34	31	25	32	46	49	51	39	33	35	29	39	33															
Newspapers .....	39	36	47	33	47	45	39	31	30	37	24	35	40	37	50	35	40															
Magazines .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—															
Did not state .....	4	8	3	1	2	3	3	1	—	2	—	3	2	2	2	3	2															

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 4. Importance of Particular Media for International, National, and Local News (Question 4)  
% of individuals

Medium most important for types of news	Province*										Communi- city		Education		Sex																
	Total		B.C.		Alta.		Sask.		Man.		Ont.		Quebec		N.B.		N.S.		Nfld.		Rural		Urban		High school or less College		Male		Female		
	%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		
<i>International News</i>																															
Television . . . . .	56	58	47	65	46	51	47	63	78	64	65	51	57	59	45	54	58														
Radio . . . . .	12	11	14	14	17	14	13	7	5	19	12	16	12	12	12	11	14														
Newspapers . . . . .	24	25	27	14	30	28	35	18	14	11	16	25	23	22	29	26	22														
Magazines . . . . .	6	4	12	7	6	6	3	4	3	6	6	5	6	4	12	7	4														
Did not state . . . . .	2	2	—	10	1	1	2	8	—	6	1	3	2	3	2	2	2														
<i>Canadian News</i>																															
Television . . . . .	48	48	37	55	45	43	47	54	76	43	67	43	49	49	44	48	48														
Radio . . . . .	19	19	21	24	22	21	18	13	11	30	10	24	18	19	17	17	21														
Newspapers . . . . .	29	30	37	16	30	33	28	24	13	24	18	26	29	27	34	30	27														
Magazines . . . . .	2	2	4	5	2	2	1	2	—	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2														
Did not state . . . . .	2	1	1	—	1	1	6	7	—	1	3	4	2	3	2	3	2														
<i>Local News</i>																															
Television . . . . .	25	17	19	21	17	21	35	36	30	15	31	24	25	26	21	25	25														
Radio . . . . .	33	40	26	49	33	33	29	25	43	47	41	38	32	34	28	32	33														
Newspapers . . . . .	39	41	52	30	50	44	29	31	27	37	27	36	40	37	48	40	38														
Magazines . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—														
Did not state . . . . .	3	2	3	—	—	2	6	7	—	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	4														

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



## CHOICE OF MEDIUM IN EMERGENCY NEWS CRISIS

*Table 5.* People tend to prefer radio in an emergency news crisis because they feel that a radio broadcast is easier to cut into with a news flash than is a TV programme. As radio is generally "background" in most homes, it is more likely that a bulletin on radio would be received than if it were televised. There is a feeling that people in cars should be aware of such crises and a recognition that radio broadcasting is the only way it could be done.

"With radio it is possible to listen to news anywhere you are."

"I have the radio on anyway."

"You can turn on a radio and get a newscast, but you have to wait for the correct time for the others."

"Radio is most spontaneous. They will cut in to let you know."

**Table 5. Medium Preferred in Emergency News Crisis (Question 5a)**

% of individuals

Medium turned to in news crisis	Province*										
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.
							Eng.	Fr.			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Radio . . . . .	76	81	83	85	77	76	78	69	81	72	67
TV . . . . .	38	30	34	34	31	43	31	38	51	40	43
Newspapers . . . . .	7	3	4	5	4	4	7	13	19	6	10
Magazines . . . . .	—	—	1	1	1	—	1	1	3	—	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## THE MEDIA AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Table 6. Assessment of Particular Media in Several Areas (Question 6)  
% of individuals

Medium which is	Province*										Communi- ty		Education		Sex	
											Rural	Urban	High school or less College	Male	Female	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.					
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Most factual</i>																
Radio . . . . .	21	24	15	20	24	19	23	25	11	30	8	25	21	22	17	24
Television . . . . .	37	37	31	29	28	33	30	50	38	31	47	27	39	38	34	39
Newspapers . . . . .	28	22	32	33	36	32	35	18	46	27	33	34	27	28	28	26
Magazines . . . . .	11	14	17	17	12	13	6	5	5	11	12	10	11	9	18	9
Did not state . . . . .	3	3	5	1	—	3	6	2	—	1	—	4	2	3	3	2
<i>Most influential</i>																
Radio . . . . .	11	14	13	7	11	10	10	12	—	16	8	14	11	12	6	11
Television . . . . .	59	53	57	68	56	56	60	68	62	45	70	59	60	59	62	61
Newspapers . . . . .	25	28	27	22	29	28	26	17	38	34	16	21	26	24	29	27
Magazines . . . . .	3	4	2	2	4	4	2	2	—	5	6	5	3	4	3	4
Did not state . . . . .	2	1	1	1	—	2	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1
<i>Most essential</i>																
Radio . . . . .	36	39	49	43	44	35	31	31	30	40	47	38	36	36	35	38
Television . . . . .	25	18	11	24	18	20	24	41	27	18	27	25	25	27	19	24
Newspapers . . . . .	36	39	38	31	38	42	41	27	43	39	22	35	37	35	42	34
Magazines . . . . .	2	2	1	2	—	2	3	1	—	1	2	1	2	1	3	2
Did not state . . . . .	1	2	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	2	2	1	—	1	1	1

*Most educational*

Radio . . . . .	4	5	5	3	7	3	5	6	5	4	2	6	4	4	4	4	4
Television . . . . .	60	60	50	61	63	63	51	58	78	70	80	53	61	63	51	59	62
Newspapers . . . . .	21	16	20	20	18	19	28	28	14	16	12	26	21	21	22	21	21
Magazines . . . . .	13	17	23	15	12	14	15	8	3	10	6	15	13	11	21	15	12
Did not state . . . . .	2	2	2	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	1	1

*Most difficult to acquire information from*

Radio . . . . .	21	26	22	19	21	20	19	22	8	18	18	20	21	20	23	21	21
Television . . . . .	28	21	17	18	33	24	19	41	22	34	20	34	27	29	22	30	26
Newspapers . . . . .	23	16	21	25	15	21	15	32	32	25	10	21	24	23	25	22	24
Magazines . . . . .	24	31	34	36	27	28	38	4	38	21	49	20	25	24	25	24	24
Did not state . . . . .	4	6	6	2	4	7	9	1	10	2	3	5	3	4	5	3	5

*Most open or frank in its presentation*

Radio . . . . .	21	23	26	17	22	20	24	18	19	28	20	17	21	21	20	20	21
Television . . . . .	39	43	35	41	33	40	39	37	54	43	39	38	39	39	38	39	39
Newspapers . . . . .	26	19	22	26	30	25	20	31	19	16	29	27	25	27	21	24	27
Magazines . . . . .	13	12	14	15	14	13	12	12	5	13	10	15	13	11	18	15	11
Did not state . . . . .	1	3	3	1	1	2	5	2	3	—	2	3	2	2	3	2	2

*The one in which the family gets most interested*

Radio . . . . .	10	10	11	11	12	9	13	7	11	11	10	12	9	10	9	9	10
Television . . . . .	77	82	77	79	83	74	64	79	78	86	80	75	78	77	77	76	78
Newspapers . . . . .	11	7	8	8	4	14	18	13	11	2	4	9	11	11	11	13	10
Magazines . . . . .	2	1	3	2	1	2	3	1	—	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	1
Did not state . . . . .	—	—	1	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	1	—	1

*Most private*

Radio . . . . .	20	26	17	18	21	20	18	20	38	23	12	22	20	22	15	20	21
Television . . . . .	15	11	11	13	9	11	12	29	14	11	10	13	15	17	7	14	16
Newspapers . . . . .	34	27	29	35	42	35	36	35	35	33	27	39	33	34	34	36	32
Magazines . . . . .	25	27	34	29	26	26	29	14	8	24	45	20	26	21	37	24	25
Did not state . . . . .	6	9	9	5	2	8	5	2	5	9	6	6	6	6	7	6	6

Table 6. Assessment of Particular Media in Several Areas (Question 6)—Continued  
% of individuals

Medium which is	Province*														Communi- ty	Education	Sex
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Québec Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	High school or less College					
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<i>Most personal, get most personally involved with</i>																	
Radio . . . . .	18	20	19	13	12	15	17	24	27	19	18	26	17	19	14	17	19
Television . . . . .	35	33	29	34	32	32	24	46	46	27	31	30	35	37	27	34	36
Newspapers . . . . .	31	29	28	25	42	34	38	26	19	31	14	29	31	30	35	33	28
Magazines . . . . .	15	16	21	27	13	17	20	4	5	22	33	12	15	13	23	14	16
Did not state . . . . .	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	—	3	1	4	3	2	1	1	2	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## MEDIA USAGE FOR INFORMATION

*Tables 7,8,9.* By using more than one medium to acquire information, people feel they are getting a cross-section that is not available from one source only. As well, media-use habits differ according to time of day. Some Canadians feel that by combining information from more than one medium, they get better coverage, or a more complete picture, of the whole event. Some like to combine the visuals of television with the detail of a newspaper.

"To get more complete coverage and different views."

"To obtain opinions as well as factual news."

"It varies, during the day I like radio, the newspaper in the evening and TV news if I stay up that late."

"Different areas of news."

"To confront what is being said. Even newspapers are specialized in their information."

"Newspapers have the detail; TV has the pictures."

**Table 7. Use of More than One Medium Daily (Question 7a)**

% of individuals

More than one medium used daily	Province*										Education		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	or less	College
							Eng.	Fr.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes .....	89	91	90	86	94	93	87	81	87	95	88	87	95
No .....	11	9	10	14	6	7	13	19	13	5	12	13	5

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 8. Media Used Daily (Question 7b)**

% of individuals who use more than one medium

Media used daily	Province*										Education		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	or less	College
							Eng.	Fr.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Radio .....	89	91	96	90	93	90	91	82	88	91	84	89	90
TV .....	91	87	92	93	91	89	93	94	100	92	100	91	92
Newspapers .....	88	90	93	76	83	92	91	81	88	89	93	87	93
Magazines .....	23	32	31	29	36	21	25	15	9	30	14	19	36

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



**Table 9. Medium Used Daily (Question 7d)**

% of individuals who use only one medium

Medium used daily	Province*										Education		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	or less	College
							Eng.	Fr.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Radio .....	37	45	41	47	36	37	62	30	50	55	20	38	35
TV .....	41	30	34	53	36	37	19	50	33	27	20	43	29
Newspapers .....	20	25	18	—	28	23	19	20	17	18	60	18	31
Magazines .....	2	—	7	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	5

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## GOVERNMENT AND OTHER INFLUENCES ON THE PRESS

**Table 10. Belief in Freedom of Press from Government Influence (Question 8a)**

% of individuals

Media free from gov't influence	Province*										Education		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	or less	College
							Eng.	Fr.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes .....	46	45	42	51	52	50	59	39	32	40	45	45	52
No .....	52	53	55	49	48	48	40	59	65	59	55	53	47
Did not state .....	2	2	3	—	—	2	1	2	3	1	—	2	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 11. Belief that Press should be Subject to Government Influence (Question 8b)**

% of individuals who believe there is government control of press

Should gov't be able to influence the press	Province*										Education		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	or less	College
							Eng.	Fr.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes .....	43	41	45	24	47	44	34	43	58	37	54	44	38
No .....	57	59	55	76	53	56	66	57	42	63	46	56	62

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 12. Things Believed to Bias Press Reporting (Question 9)**

% of individuals

Things which bias reporting	Province*										Education		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	High school or less	College
							Eng.	Fr.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Federal Government</i>													
Yes . . . . .	52	55	60	59	60	53	43	45	60	65	49	54	48
No . . . . .	41	34	32	34	39	39	48	52	35	33	40	40	46
Did not state . .	7	11	8	7	1	8	9	3	5	2	11	6	6
<i>Local Government</i>													
Yes . . . . .	44	43	46	46	39	42	42	45	41	66	39	44	43
No . . . . .	49	44	43	46	58	50	45	52	49	30	51	49	49
Did not state . .	7	13	11	8	3	8	13	3	10	4	10	7	8
<i>Local police</i>													
Yes . . . . .	32	33	35	31	27	35	24	32	22	40	25	34	26
No . . . . .	59	53	53	61	70	57	59	66	68	54	63	58	65
Did not state . .	9	14	12	8	3	8	17	2	10	6	12	8	9
<i>Federal police</i>													
Yes . . . . .	33	35	36	34	33	34	21	32	27	47	20	35	27
No . . . . .	58	50	52	61	65	56	63	66	62	46	67	57	64
Did not state . .	9	15	12	5	2	10	16	2	11	7	13	8	9
<i>Big Business</i>													
Yes . . . . .	65	72	70	58	64	67	55	62	62	82	45	64	72
No . . . . .	29	20	23	34	34	27	33	36	27	15	43	31	23
Did not state . .	6	8	7	8	2	6	12	2	11	3	12	5	5
<i>Criminal elements (Mafia)</i>													
Yes . . . . .	38	39	38	40	33	36	30	43	32	48	31	39	34
No . . . . .	53	45	49	52	62	53	56	54	54	47	55	51	57
Did not state . .	9	16	13	8	5	11	14	3	14	5	14	10	9

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 13.** Those who believe that the Mafia, or criminal elements, influence reporting say that the tactics used by the Mafia are threats and payoffs, mainly at the reporter level.

“Pay off the reporters.”

“Threats.”

“They limit what they allow to be published about themselves.”

Table 13. Belief that Mafia (or criminal elements) Influences Press Reporting  
(Question 10)

Mafia influence reporting	% of individuals														
	Province*											Community		Sex	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	Male	Female
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes .....	42	49	42	47	29	38	27	50	41	48	29	49	41	39	45
No .....	54	47	51	51	68	57	66	48	51	46	71	47	54	57	50
Did not state ...	4	4	7	2	3	5	7	2	8	6	—	4	5	4	5

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## INFORMATION LEVELS—FIVE YEARS AGO AND TODAY

Table 14. The belief is general that news reporting has improved over the past five years. Competition among the media has made for a better reporting system. Satellites have made news stories available faster and more efficiently, so that newscasts are more current.

"There is more coverage, especially on TV."

"The news media at the present has more scope than it did five years ago."

"All media are more frank and open than they used to be."

"Deeper involvement, better reporting."

"I believe the news is more accessible; the media is better organized; more information because the reporters improved."

Table 14. Belief that Press Reporting has Improved over Past Five Years (Question 11)  
% of individuals

Reporting improved over past five years	Province*											Communi- ty	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes .....	86	83	82	79	92	86	86	91	84	88	90	80	87
No .....	13	17	18	21	8	14	11	8	16	12	6	20	12
Did not state .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	—	—	4	—	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## EASIEST AND MOST DIFFICULT MEDIA

**Table 15. Assessment of Media as Sources of Information (Questions 12 and 13)**

% of individuals

Medium and ease or difficulty of getting information	Province*										Education		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	or less	College
							Eng.	Fr.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Easiest medium to get information from, effortless</i>													
Television . . . . .	51	50	59	49	31	49	53	60	46	43	51	51	55
Radio . . . . .	35	37	27	38	45	37	32	32	49	41	35	37	30
Newspapers . . . . .	11	11	11	10	19	12	12	7	5	13	12	10	12
Magazines . . . . .	2	2	2	3	4	2	3	1	—	2	2	2	2
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
<i>Medium requiring most energy, concentration</i>													
Television . . . . .	12	16	9	10	16	11	15	14	5	16	20	14	7
Radio . . . . .	7	7	4	5	2	7	8	7	5	11	6	7	6
Newspapers . . . . .	55	44	53	47	62	54	45	67	56	47	53	57	50
Magazines . . . . .	25	32	34	38	18	28	29	11	24	26	18	22	36
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	—	—	2	—	3	1	1	—	3	—	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## THE MEDIA — LIKES AND DISLIKES

*Questions 14 to 17.* Most people like TV because it is a relaxing form of entertainment which requires little preparation to enjoy. It is virtually instant entertainment.

"It is the most entertaining."

"Sit down and relax and it informs me."

"It is relaxing to sit down and watch a good program."

TV is educational. People like the visual presentation of facts and of entertainment. They understand the news better because they can see what has happened. It allows them to partake of parts of life which ordinarily would be inaccessible.

"Brings the world into your house."

"It is live and descriptive and it tells the story."

"It is very graphic; you can understand it more readily."

"For the children it brings the world of nature and geography into their homes and is more real because you can see it."

"For instance, their films about hurricanes, etc., I can see what they are really talking about."

Most people have special programmes or types of programmes which they enjoy watching on TV: sports, soap operas, variety shows, family shows, and so on. The programming mix is varied sufficiently to attract all ages.

"Films, hockey and baseball."

"I like the news."

"It is informative relaxation. It has become a need."

The main dislike with TV is the timing and content of commercials. Good movies interrupted every few minutes for a word from the sponsor lose some of their appeal. Some comment that commercials are broadcast too often; they tire of them after seeing them six or seven times.

"Continuity is broken frequently with disgusting advertising."

"The playing down of the average intelligent person by the advertisers."

"Commercials."

Programming content is attacked by those who have specific types of likes in terms of viewing habits and who are not tolerant toward the attitudes of others. These people are of the attitude that their type of programme is fine to air, but another's favourite is not.

"Brainwashing for the younger generation."

"Programs levelled at an age level of ten years."

"It never suits the whole family at one time."

"Feminine programs."

"Football and hockey games."

Radio is a flexible medium. Canadians like it because it can provide a background mood for any mood at any time of the day. It does not provide a fixed format to live by because of the multiplicity of stations and types of receivers as compared to TV. People rely on radio for time checks, up-to-the-minute news and weather forecasts, and most of all for music.

"The music. One's imagination is stimulated."

"Radio is entertaining and informative."

"It is a relaxing medium and provides background."

"Have one at home and work, or you can carry one with you."

"It's relaxing too. I can read the newspaper while the radio is on."

"Weather reports, time checks, local news—it is always interesting."

"I can listen to it and it gives me a happy feeling. I like music and can turn mine on to suit me."

There are few, if any dislikes with radio. As with TV, there are programme preferences. Some say the advertising displeases them, but it is not nearly as pronounced a negative as it is with TV.

"Not too much I would say."

"I wouldn't say I dislike it."

"There's not much except one program."

"Too many ads."

"Ads break up the mood music."



Newspapers offer people selection in the news they want to read, whereas radio and TV present a package. The reader can select what news he wants to read. He can then select what detail he wants to read, intensive or extensive. People also like the editorials; they stimulate thought and discussion about the news and are separate from the facts. Readers also enjoy specific columnists and their viewpoints. They represent guides or challenges to the reader's own line of thought. The advertising in newspapers is praised by some rather than criticized. It represents news to then—which store has what merchandise on sale, etc. It is a necessary and often interesting part of the newspaper.

“The great variety of subjects in each edition.”

“They give me the most detail and the most information.”

“I like editorial comment, wider areas covered as news and day-to-day useful information.”

“Some of the columnists.”

“It gives us all our local news and its advertising enables us to know where to shop.”

“I get a lot of advertising that you can read and see that you don't get on the radio.”

“If there's something you don't want to read you don't have to.”

“The reading can be done at your own time. It can wait for five minutes.”

There are few negative comments about newspapers because the reader can be selective. Some negative comments indicate some concern for sensationalizing in headlines designed to develop interest in an article that is lacking in interest.

“Often the content has little connection with the headlines. Often the headlines are misleading.”

“Headlines out of proportion to the story.”

“Sensation news.”

## PRESS, POLITICIANS, AND PRIVACY

*Table 16.* There is general agreement across Canada that Mr. Trudeau has been treated in a fair way. Only one in ten feel he has not been treated fairly in the press. Some three in ten believe that he had been treated very fairly.

“He gets his fair share. Some is bad, but mostly good.”

“Reported pretty much as it happens.”

“I don't think there is exaggeration on either side.”

“On the whole they have been good, at the same time have criticized him.”

Overall, reports concerning Mr. Stanfield have not been unfair. About four in ten Canadians say Mr. Stanfield has been treated in a very fair way. More men than women (41 per cent *v.* 34 per cent) think Mr. Stanfield has been treated very fairly.

“He is not a controversial figure.”

“I haven't seen anything about him that has been biased to one extreme or the other.”

“They report him pretty much as he is.”

Some three to four in ten say the NDP has been treated very fairly in the press. More men than women (39 per cent v. 30 per cent) say they have been treated very fairly. Few feel that the NDP has been unfairly treated.

"Any reporting I have seen has been fairly reasonable."

"They all seem to get equal publicity."

"Everything has been on an even keel."

**Table 16. Opinion of Press Treatment of Trudeau, Stanfield, and NDP (Questions 18a, b, c)**  
% of individuals

Media and treatment of politicians or parties	Province*											Sex	
												Male	Female
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	Eng.	Fr.	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Treatment of</i>													
<i>Mr. Trudeau</i>													
Very fair . . . . .	29	26	26	21	31	24	28	39	22	31	25	34	24
Somewhat fair . . . . .	48	51	53	57	48	56	50	32	57	53	43	44	53
Not at all fair . . . . .	13	10	11	15	14	13	16	11	19	11	12	12	13
Other . . . . .	7	9	6	7	6	5	5	12	—	1	10	8	6
Did not state . . . . .	3	4	4	—	1	2	1	6	2	4	10	2	4
<i>Mr. Stanfield</i>													
Very fair . . . . .	38	26	39	44	41	34	40	42	54	36	47	41	34
Somewhat fair . . . . .	36	46	38	41	41	45	37	16	35	48	29	36	37
Not at all fair . . . . .	10	13	11	12	4	12	8	6	5	12	2	10	10
Other . . . . .	10	10	3	3	11	5	8	22	—	4	8	8	11
Did not state . . . . .	6	5	9	—	3	4	7	14	6	—	14	5	8
<i>New Democratic Party</i>													
Very fair . . . . .	35	25	35	32	38	37	34	34	38	24	31	39	30
Somewhat fair . . . . .	31	43	34	44	39	36	30	15	27	33	20	30	32
Not at all fair . . . . .	12	20	13	14	15	14	8	6	5	24	14	13	11
Other . . . . .	11	5	7	4	6	7	10	24	5	6	12	9	13
Did not state . . . . .	11	7	11	6	2	6	18	21	25	13	23	9	14

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in regional break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 17.** They mention that already the public has been told everything about his personal habits, his likes and dislikes, his dates, his clothes, his holidays. Most disapprove of the press's revealing so much of this.

"I don't think they would have bothered if he were a married man."

"What Mr. Trudeau has for breakfast, what he does and how he does it is unimportant."

"They play up things that are of little importance."

"What he wears and such is his business."

"When he took that last trip I heard he was away with a woman and I think what he does privately is his business."

"They have shown too much of his going out. He has a right to a private life."

Most people feel there is a lack of excitement or glamour to Stanfield's private life that could be reported upon.

"There is not too much to invade."

"He is married."

"He is not colourful enough to raise any interest."

"He has a stable family life."

"He doesn't get into the same situations."

The reason Canadians fear newspapers is that they feel that newspapers slant stories in order to capture more readers, and that this is done without any regard for the individual involved.

"Everybody reads the paper. They print what they want so people will get stirred up."

"Reporters will pay, talk to your friends, etc."

"A report is edited so much the final report is not adequate."

"It is written down for all to observe."

"Newspaper reporters seem to have little or no respect for the feelings of the general public."

Those who do not fear press invasion of their privacy say they are just ordinary people with nothing to hide, nothing to be ashamed of, nothing in their lives of interest to anyone except themselves.

"It's up to oneself to live above this."

"Because I'm just a small individual."

"I am not interesting enough."

**Table 17. The Press and Private Lives of Politicians** (Questions 19a, b, c, d; 20a, b, c; 21a, b, c)  
% of individuals

Media and politicians' private lives	Province*									
	Quebec									
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S. Nfld.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Private lives of politicians should be reported by press</i>										
Agree .....	22	28	25	28	25	27	20	13	19	16
Disagree .....	77	70	75	69	75	72	79	87	81	84
Did not state .....	1	2	—	3	—	1	1	—	—	—
<i>Press has invaded Mr. Trudeau's life</i>										
Agree .....	75	71	68	83	79	74	78	74	87	80
Disagree .....	24	26	30	17	21	24	19	24	13	20
Did not state .....	1	3	2	—	—	2	3	2	—	—
<i>Medium most unfair to Mr. Trudeau</i>										
Newspapers .....	62	55	55	49	61	64	68	71	68	51
Television .....	11	14	9	19	17	10	8	8	14	19
Radio .....	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	6
Magazines .....	9	12	15	19	10	8	7	6	3	7
Did not state .....	16	18	20	11	9	16	14	13	12	17

**Table 17. The Press and Private Lives of Politicians**  
(Questions 19a, b, c, d; 20a, b, c; 21a, b, c) — *Continued*

% of individuals

Media and politicians' private lives	Province*										
	Quebec										Nfld.
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Press has invaded</i>											
<i>Mr. Stanfield's life</i>											
Agree .....	9	12	7	10	11	8	5	9	22	10	6
Disagree .....	85	82	87	90	86	88	90	80	70	90	88
Did not state .....	6	6	6	—	3	4	5	11	8	—	6
<i>Medium most unfair</i>											
<i>to Mr. Stanfield</i>											
Newspapers .....	26	20	17	28	35	24	14	35	19	37	10
Television .....	6	7	5	11	13	6	3	5	8	10	—
Radio .....	1	1	—	—	2	2	3	2	—	—	4
Magazines .....	6	6	7	13	6	5	1	3	8	2	31
Did not state .....	61	66	71	48	44	63	79	55	65	61	55
<i>Medium feared most</i>											
<i>for invasion of</i>											
<i>own privacy</i>											
Newspapers .....	53	57	39	42	48	54	50	59	68	64	18
Radio .....	2	3	4	3	3	2	2	2	5	4	—
Television .....	11	9	9	17	18	11	13	10	5	8	10
Magazines .....	3	1	3	7	1	3	5	2	—	1	4
None .....	31	30	45	31	30	30	28	25	22	23	67
Did not state .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## THE MEDIA — INFLUENCE

**Table 18. Opinion of Effect of Media in General on Thought and Life-Style (Question 22a)**

% of individuals

Media influence thought and life-style	Province*											Education	
												High school or less	College
	Quebec												
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.		
Yes . . . . .	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
No . . . . .	89	91	94	89	91	90	89	85	87	88	71	87	97
Did not state . . . .	11	8	6	11	8	9	11	15	13	12	29	13	3
	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 19. Opinion of Effect of Media in Particular on Thought and Life-Style (Question 22b)**

% of individuals who feel media have an effect

Medium most influential on thought and life-style	Province*											Education	
												High school or less	College
	Quebec												
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Newspapers . . . . .	28	20	30	24	28	30	38	29	37	24	10	30	25
Radio . . . . .	3	4	4	—	5	4	5	2	—	5	10	4	2
TV . . . . .	66	74	65	72	66	64	55	65	63	68	80	64	73
Magazines . . . . .	3	2	1	4	1	2	2	4	—	3	—	2	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Question 22c.** The personal involvement with TV is the most important factor. The visual helps perception.

- "The picture tells the story and the memory lingers."
- "Family life. Children watch it and are most influenced."
- "More people watch TV and you can 'see' it."
- "The picture shows me. You're right there."
- "Appeals to more people; affects all your sensory perceptions."
- "You look at it and it makes an impression on you."
- "The reports are alive."

Canadians who believe newspapers are the most powerful medium, are mostly of the opinion that by reading something one will be influenced more.

- "We have a tendency to believe the papers more than the other media."
- "People read things and remember them."
- "We can read over and over and learn better."



## RELIANCE ON THE MEDIA

Table 20. Reliance on Media over Specified Time Periods (Question 23)  
% of individuals

Medium most reluctant to lose	Province*												Education			Age																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Total						B.C.			Alta.			Sask.			Man.			Ont.			Quebec			N.B.			N.S.			Nfld.			High school or less			College			Under 25			25-44			Over 44																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 21. Assessment of Media as Sources of Information in Specific Cases (Question 24)

% of individuals

Media, specific case, adequacy of information	Province*												Education		Sex	
	Total				Quebec				N.B.				High school or less		Male	Female
	%	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	%	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	%	College	%	%
<i>Language Bill</i>																
Well informed	23	17	27	24	21	22	31	21	22	22	36	27	22	27	23	22
Somewhat informed	38	30	36	38	44	37	40	41	32	30	33	33	37	40	38	38
Inadequately informed	17	23	13	16	13	17	15	18	14	14	8	12	17	16	17	17
Poorly informed	22	30	23	22	22	22	13	17	30	25	27	27	23	17	22	21
Did not state	—	—	1	—	—	2	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	—	—	2
<i>Stafford Smythe Case</i>																
Well informed	10	9	7	11	5	14	8	5	8	23	8	8	10	12	12	8
Somewhat informed	24	18	18	20	20	31	25	16	22	25	18	18	23	26	27	20
Inadequately informed	16	20	13	14	17	16	8	19	14	10	14	14	16	15	17	15
Poorly informed	45	50	57	50	57	35	51	51	46	41	59	59	46	44	40	50
Did not state	5	3	5	5	1	4	8	9	10	1	1	1	5	3	4	7
<i>Arab-Israeli Conflict</i>																
Well informed	39	38	50	40	40	42	50	23	24	52	47	47	34	55	42	35
Somewhat informed	34	38	32	41	33	34	32	33	35	23	35	35	35	28	33	34
Inadequately informed	12	13	5	9	14	10	10	18	14	12	4	13	8	11	13	13
Poorly informed	14	11	12	10	11	11	7	22	22	13	14	14	16	8	13	15
Did not state	1	—	1	—	2	3	1	4	5	—	—	—	2	1	1	3
<i>B.C. Election</i>																
Well informed	25	77	36	28	24	18	22	13	11	17	8	8	23	31	26	23
Somewhat informed	32	14	34	30	46	33	40	31	27	41	49	49	31	38	34	30
Inadequately informed	16	4	15	25	12	15	16	23	16	7	10	10	16	12	16	15
Poorly informed	24	5	15	16	18	30	17	29	41	35	31	31	27	17	22	27
Did not state	3	—	—	1	—	4	5	4	5	—	—	2	3	2	2	5

Table 21. Assessment of Media as Sources of Information in Specific Cases (Question 24) - Continued  
% of individuals

Media, case, adequacy of information	Province*												Education		Sex
	Total						Quebec						High school or less		
	%	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	College	Male	Female	
<i>Separatism</i>															
Well informed . . . . .	41	30	42	42	37	40	60	39	41	54	37	38	51	39	43
Somewhat informed . . . . .	35	31	31	30	37	37	29	38	41	30	45	37	29	36	34
Inadequately informed . . . . .	12	26	15	17	12	10	5	10	8	6	10	12	10	13	11
Poorly informed . . . . .	11	13	11	11	14	11	6	12	8	10	8	12	10	12	11
Did not state . . . . .	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	1
<i>Homosexual Bill</i>															
Well informed . . . . .	33	18	23	24	21	30	43	48	22	37	22	32	35	31	35
Somewhat informed . . . . .	36	42	38	35	36	36	36	33	51	34	41	36	40	36	37
Inadequately informed . . . . .	14	22	18	17	24	14	12	12	8	6	12	14	15	16	13
Poorly informed . . . . .	15	17	20	23	19	19	8	6	16	23	25	17	10	17	14
Did not state . . . . .	2	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	1	-	-	1
<i>National Medicare Plan</i>															
Well informed . . . . .	30	24	37	35	34	28	24	24	22	63	67	31	28	28	32
Somewhat informed . . . . .	31	41	27	34	34	27	37	31	49	21	25	30	32	30	32
Inadequately informed . . . . .	20	22	20	18	17	18	23	28	11	12	6	20	22	21	20
Poorly informed . . . . .	18	13	15	12	15	26	15	16	16	4	2	18	18	20	15
Did not state . . . . .	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	1	1
<i>Moon Landing</i>															
Well informed . . . . .	91	97	95	96	91	92	96	85	95	89	88	90	94	91	91
Somewhat informed . . . . .	7	2	5	3	9	6	3	11	3	8	12	8	4	7	7
Inadequately informed . . . . .	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	1	1	1
Poorly informed . . . . .	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1
Did not state . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total

## DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION FROM GOVERNMENT

Table 22. Canadians who feel that the Government should take steps to inform its citizens independently of what the media report, feel this method of reporting would be more exact, less filtered than what is being presented right now.

"They know the real truth."

"The best way to get information is right from the horse's mouth."

"It would be more exact than the interpretation of the media."

"The news would be more direct, not so confused."

Those who feel the media should retain the job of informing us are of the opinion that the job they are doing now is satisfactory and that duplication would only cost the taxpayers more money.

"It would be dangerous and expensive to switch."

"Why bring something else in when you already have one."

"They do a good job of coverage now."

"Government couldn't do it better."

"Too expensive independently."

"When we are well served, why change? "

Table 22. Opinion of Government News Sources Apart from Commercial Ones (Question 25)  
% of individuals

Government should	Total	Province*									
		B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.
							Eng.	Fr.			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ely totally on the media . . . . .	60	59	67	61	70	59	63	57	51	72	49
inform independently . . . . .	37	36	29	36	27	39	36	41	46	28	45
Did not state . . . . .	3	5	4	3	3	2	1	2	3	—	6

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## NEWSPAPERS — GENERAL

Table 23. Opinion of Practicality or Impracticality of Newspaper Reporting (Question 26)  
% of individuals

Newspaper reporting is	Province*										
	Total	Quebec									
		B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Practical . . . . .	80	74	80	76	87	79	73	85	76	72	82
Impractical . . . . .	16	20	17	23	13	16	16	12	24	22	18
Did not state . . . . .	4	6	3	1	—	5	11	3	—	6	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 24. Opinion on What Interests Newspapers Represent (Question 27)

		% of individuals												
Newspapers represent interests of	Total	Province*										Sex		
		B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec				Male	Female		
							Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.			Nfld.	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Advertising, Big Business	29	42	31	29	24	30	38	26	27	25	14	33	26	
Public at large . . . . .	57	48	53	52	64	58	50	58	60	51	80	53	61	
Government in Power . .	11	7	13	15	7	10	5	15	13	22	6	11	11	
Did not state . . . . .	3	3	3	4	5	2	7	1	—	2	—	3	2	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## POLITICIANS AND THE PRESS

Table 25. Most bias is attributed to newspapers. Many people feel that newspapers have political affiliations, and that this fact filters the truth to some extent.

"Some papers have leanings towards the political parties."

"Different papers like different parties."

"Most papers are 'pro' Liberal or 'pro' something else."

Table 25. Opinion on Whether or Not There is Bias in Media Political Reporting (Questions 28 and 29)

	% of individuals										
	Province*										
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	Eng.	Fr.	%	%	%
<i>Media Coverage of Politicians</i>											
Very biased . . . . .	15	19	13	16	11	12	13	19	19	15	6
Somewhat biased . . . . .	60	60	65	60	67	61	65	57	54	66	49
Not biased . . . . .	21	18	17	23	20	24	19	20	24	17	33
Did not state . . . . .	4	3	5	1	2	3	3	4	3	2	12
<i>Medium most biased in favour of ideas of Government</i>											
Television . . . . .	52	42	45	51	52	43	46	71	43	49	55
Radio . . . . .	8	6	11	13	10	7	3	5	14	11	22
Newspapers . . . . .	24	33	26	28	24	29	24	13	14	24	12
Did not state . . . . .	16	19	18	8	14	21	27	11	29	16	11
<i>Medium most biased against ideas of Government</i>											
Television . . . . .	16	16	18	23	19	16	7	15	14	25	6
Radio . . . . .	12	15	13	12	13	12	8	13	11	10	14
Newspapers . . . . .	36	41	35	37	40	38	40	29	27	36	43
Did not state . . . . .	36	28	34	28	28	34	45	43	48	29	37

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



Table 26. Opinion of Media's influence in Specific Social Questions (Question 30)  
% of individuals who believe the media had some effect

Media influential in social problems	Province*										Community		Age		Education	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	High school or less
	%	%	%	%	%	%	Eng.	Fr.	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Increase in drug addiction</i>																
Television . . . . .	61	65	66	72	65	62	50	54	60	71	67	70	55	63	62	61
Newspapers . . . . .	51	61	55	47	50	49	46	54	30	41	41	46	52	51	51	50
Radio . . . . .	28	34	33	34	27	27	21	27	24	28	27	29	27	28	29	27
<i>Smoking by young people</i>																
Television . . . . .	72	80	74	79	71	77	69	62	60	68	76	70	74	72	72	69
Newspapers . . . . .	40	49	37	38	42	38	31	43	32	30	37	40	39	37	43	37
Radio . . . . .	31	34	34	36	24	31	25	30	32	33	39	33	31	29	32	30
<i>Divorce</i>																
Television . . . . .	47	53	49	49	45	44	35	53	30	40	49	50	48	46	47	45
Newspapers . . . . .	39	38	37	27	34	34	29	57	19	29	45	43	39	36	41	39
Radio . . . . .	19	18	22	11	17	13	13	29	8	21	29	21	17	19	20	18
<i>Promiscuity</i>																
Television . . . . .	57	68	67	70	64	60	42	47	43	52	47	63	53	60	57	54
Newspapers . . . . .	38	39	33	39	38	38	30	46	14	27	20	43	38	36	39	36
Radio . . . . .	19	14	22	22	18	18	13	23	8	16	22	26	18	18	20	18

Table 26. Opinion of Media's influence in Specific Social Questions (Question 30) — Continued  
% of individuals who believe the media had some effect

Media influential in social problems	Province*												Community				Age		Education												
	Total B.C.			Alta.		Sask.		Man.		Ont.		Quebec		N.B.		N.S.		Nfld.		Rural		Urban		Under 25		Over 25-44		High school or less			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
<i>Alcoholism</i>																															
Television . . . . .	52	55	49	57	62	55	31	49	38	49	59	63	51	54	49	55	51	55													
Newspapers . . . . .	32	36	27	30	31	31	17	42	14	19	27	37	32	37	28	35	32	31													
Radio . . . . .	19	18	15	21	20	18	9	25	5	16	16	24	18	21	17	20	19	18													
<i>Increased desire for education</i>																															
Television . . . . .	85	83	86	90	86	81	81	89	84	89	88	88	85	84	87	83	86	81													
Newspapers . . . . .	77	78	80	75	77	77	77	78	81	75	76	83	77	75	78	79	78	79													
Radio . . . . .	65	67	65	66	70	58	59	73	65	76	71	74	64	64	64	64	66	64													
<i>Student protests</i>																															
Television . . . . .	80	88	83	86	81	81	69	74	68	87	80	83	80	79	83	77	78	87													
Newspapers . . . . .	72	82	70	67	67	73	71	72	65	69	61	72	73	73	73	71	70	81													
Radio . . . . .	52	59	51	50	50	50	46	56	43	51	47	52	52	58	52	48	50	60													
<i>Labour's poor image</i>																															
Television . . . . .	52	59	55	57	54	51	50	49	38	49	57	58	51	55	51	51	52	53													
Newspapers . . . . .	59	72	63	60	59	60	61	50	32	63	69	60	59	63	59	57	57	68													
Radio . . . . .	37	46	42	44	37	37	30	33	22	39	45	41	37	37	38	37	36	42													
<i>Canadian Nationalism</i>																															
Television . . . . .	64	68	74	67	70	65	57	56	62	69	71	71	64	65	65	63	62	75													
Newspapers . . . . .	66	66	71	62	66	71	62	59	60	63	65	65	66	69	65	65	62	78													
Radio . . . . .	51	50	59	54	57	53	45	44	49	53	55	55	50	51	51	49	48	61													

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# MEDIA CONTENT – VIOLENCE, SEX, AND DRUG USAGE

Table 27. Opinion on Amount of Violence, Sex, and Drug Usage in Media Content (Question 31)  
% of individuals who believe there has been too much

Media content contains too much	Province *										Community Education				Age				Sex	
	Quebec																			
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Ft.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
<i>Violence</i>																				
Television . . . . .	78	78	82	82	84	79	77	77	78	76	67	85	78	77	83	68	78	85	75	83
Newspapers . . . . .	56	56	49	44	51	52	56	72	51	39	33	57	56	55	61	56	54	58	51	61
Radio . . . . .	25	20	21	16	18	20	26	40	30	15	8	26	24	24	25	23	20	31	24	25
<i>Sex</i>																				
Television . . . . .	66	63	73	77	75	68	48	62	78	75	49	74	66	67	65	50	65	76	60	72
Newspapers . . . . .	41	39	36	26	40	37	33	60	24	19	20	45	40	40	41	31	38	49	37	44
Radio . . . . .	18	12	19	15	20	15	16	27	19	11	8	22	18	18	19	9	16	26	16	20
<i>Drug Usage</i>																				
Television . . . . .	54	54	62	56	57	56	41	49	54	59	49	59	54	54	53	43	53	61	52	56
Newspapers . . . . .	45	46	47	30	36	41	40	60	43	37	27	47	45	45	47	45	44	47	43	47
Radio . . . . .	21	18	21	11	21	19	16	30	19	18	8	24	21	21	21	17	18	27	20	21

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# MEDIA CONTENT — DOES IT INFLUENCE?

Table 28. Opinion on Social Influence of Media Content (Question 32a, b, c, d)  
% of individuals

	Province*										Community			Education		Age		Sex	
	Quebec										Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under 25	25-44	% Over 44	% Male	% Female
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.									
<i>Too Much Sex</i>																			
Newspapers:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	19	10	18	13	8	12	19	42	3	6	4	21	19	18	13	18	25	16	23
Agree somewhat . . . . .	25	25	22	24	25	27	13	28	13	15	12	29	25	24	24	24	27	24	26
Disagree . . . . .	55	64	59	63	65	60	67	29	84	78	84	49	56	57	63	58	48	59	51
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	1	—	2	1	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—
Television:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	50	53	59	64	62	49	33	44	65	59	37	60	49	48	32	49	61	43	57
Agree somewhat . . . . .	22	18	16	23	21	20	22	27	11	17	22	22	22	21	24	23	18	22	21
Disagree . . . . .	27	29	24	13	17	29	42	28	24	24	41	17	28	27	44	27	20	34	21
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	1	—	—	2	3	1	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	1	1	1	1
Radio:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	7	4	9	3	6	4	8	16	8	2	—	12	7	5	3	6	11	7	8
Agree somewhat . . . . .	11	10	12	9	10	8	4	18	3	7	4	12	11	12	7	10	13	10	11
Disagree . . . . .	80	84	79	86	84	86	84	64	84	90	96	76	80	80	89	82	72	81	79
Did not state . . . . .	2	2	—	2	—	2	—	2	5	1	—	—	2	2	1	2	4	2	2
Magazines:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	44	44	46	52	51	40	31	51	32	48	31	57	43	45	32	44	51	43	46
Agree somewhat . . . . .	29	30	27	35	21	31	24	27	46	29	43	25	30	30	33	31	25	27	31

Disagree ..... 20 23 24 13 18 22 35 13 16 16 25 15 21 18 26 31 20 13 23 17  
 Did not state ..... 7 3 3 - 10 7 10 9 6 7 1 3 6 7 4 4 5 9 7 6

### Concerned About Social Problems

#### Newspapers:

Agree strongly ..... 33 27 27 23 32 31 44 42 14 25 22 31 33 31 39 30 33 35 32 34  
 Agree somewhat ..... 49 57 59 59 50 51 41 39 68 51 57 50 50 50 47 53 49 48 48 50  
 Disagree ..... 17 16 14 18 17 17 13 17 18 22 18 18 17 18 13 17 17 16 19 15  
 Did not state ..... 1 - - - 1 1 2 2 - 2 3 1 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

#### Television:

Agree strongly ..... 29 22 28 22 31 27 25 36 22 29 27 29 28 27 33 31 27 29 26 31  
 Agree somewhat ..... 48 54 53 58 46 47 50 40 60 48 55 49 48 48 49 45 50 47 47 48  
 Disagree ..... 22 23 18 19 22 24 21 23 18 22 18 22 23 24 16 24 22 22 25 20  
 Did not state ..... 1 1 1 1 1 2 4 1 - 1 1 1 1 1 2 - 1 2 2 1

#### Radio:

Agree strongly ..... 25 23 21 24 39 22 28 29 19 34 25 30 25 26 23 19 27 27 23 28  
 Agree somewhat ..... 48 60 61 57 40 53 44 33 49 47 57 47 49 48 51 44 49 50 47 50  
 Disagree ..... 24 15 18 17 20 23 24 35 27 18 18 23 24 25 21 37 23 20 28 21  
 Did not state ..... 3 2 - 2 1 2 4 3 5 1 - - 2 1 5 - 1 3 2 1

#### Magazines:

Agree strongly ..... 28 21 30 21 32 27 24 34 14 21 14 30 27 26 33 27 27 29 27 29  
 Agree somewhat ..... 46 53 51 52 40 48 44 35 62 53 55 46 46 44 51 48 47 43 44 47  
 Disagree ..... 20 20 17 25 18 19 22 22 19 21 27 21 21 23 13 22 21 19 23 18  
 Did not state ..... 6 6 2 2 - 6 10 9 5 5 4 3 6 7 3 3 5 9 6 6

### Too Much Drugs

#### Newspapers:

Agree strongly ..... 23 23 21 18 13 17 21 41 5 13 4 24 23 23 23 16 22 28 22 25  
 Agree somewhat ..... 25 29 21 16 25 26 17 26 30 27 25 27 24 25 23 27 24 24 24 25  
 Disagree ..... 51 48 58 66 61 56 61 32 65 59 71 48 52 51 53 56 53 46 53 50  
 Did not state ..... 1 - - - 1 1 1 1 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 -

#### Television:

Agree strongly ..... 35 41 38 41 42 35 21 31 43 47 25 43 35 36 32 22 35 42 32 38  
 Agree somewhat ..... 24 18 27 30 25 23 19 27 22 23 29 26 24 23 27 23 24 24 25 24  
 Disagree ..... 40 40 35 29 32 40 56 42 32 30 46 31 41 40 39 54 40 32 42 38  
 Did not state ..... 1 1 - - 1 2 4 - 3 - - - 1 2 1 1 2 1 -



Table 28. Opinion on Social Influence of Media Content (Question 32a,b,c,d) — Continued  
% of individuals

	Province*										Community		Education		Age		Sex			
	Total	Quebec										Urban	High school or less	College	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female	
		B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.									Rural
Radio:																				
Agree strongly	9	13	10	3	6	6	3	15	8	8	—	14	8	9	8	4	8	12	8	10
Agree somewhat	15	15	15	16	13	13	6	22	14	11	16	14	15	15	16	14	14	17	15	16
Disagree	74	71	74	80	80	79	86	61	73	80	84	72	74	74	72	82	76	67	75	72
Did not state	2	1	1	1	1	2	5	2	5	1	—	—	3	2	4	—	2	4	2	2
Magazines:																				
Agree strongly	32	34	30	37	36	29	26	36	22	40	22	35	32	32	29	23	31	38	31	32
Agree somewhat	28	30	30	36	24	26	24	29	41	27	49	29	28	29	28	32	30	25	29	27
Disagree	33	33	38	26	31	39	40	27	32	25	27	33	34	32	38	42	34	28	33	34
Did not state	7	3	2	1	9	6	10	8	5	8	2	3	6	7	5	3	5	9	7	7
Too Much Violence																				
Newspapers:																				
Agree strongly	32	28	24	21	22	25	35	56	19	19	8	33	32	33	30	32	30	37	30	35
Agree somewhat	25	31	16	21	23	28	24	25	24	23	29	26	25	25	28	23	26	26	24	26
Disagree	41	41	59	57	55	46	40	18	57	57	63	40	42	42	41	45	44	36	45	38
Did not state	2	—	1	1	—	1	1	1	—	1	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	1	1	1
Television:																				
Agree strongly	65	67	70	68	68	63	56	65	73	65	49	75	64	64	66	52	65	71	59	70
Agree somewhat	18	16	17	19	19	17	18	20	14	17	20	14	18	18	19	21	18	16	18	18
Disagree	17	17	13	13	12	19	21	15	13	17	31	11	17	18	12	27	16	12	21	12
Did not state	—	—	—	—	1	1	5	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	3	—	1	1	2	—
Radio:																				
Agree strongly	9	9	8	3	—	4	7	24	—	1	—	12	9	9	9	8	7	13	9	10
Agree somewhat	12	9	13	9	12	11	7	20	8	7	6	17	12	12	14	11	13	13	11	14

Agree strongly . . . . .

Table 28. Opinion on Social Influence of Media Content (Question 32a,b,c,d) — *Continued*  
% of individuals

	Province*										Community		Education		Age		Sex	
	Quebec										Urban		High school or less		Under 25		Over 44	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural						
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Agree somewhat . . . . .	25	22	26	31	22	23	23	28	14	19	33	23	24	25	30	24	21	24
Disagree . . . . .	59	68	67	62	66	63	64	42	72	70	59	59	60	59	56	63	55	61
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	—	—	2	1	2	1	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	1	2	1
Television:																		
Agree strongly . . . . .	20	25	18	24	28	19	11	21	27	18	14	24	20	20	16	18	26	20
Agree somewhat . . . . .	30	30	39	33	29	29	24	29	30	33	49	28	30	30	35	31	28	29
Disagree . . . . .	48	45	42	43	42	51	62	50	43	49	37	48	49	49	48	51	44	50
Did not state . . . . .	2	—	1	—	1	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	2	1
Radio:																		
Agree strongly . . . . .	5	2	2	3	3	4	3	11	3	2	—	6	5	5	5	3	7	5
Agree somewhat . . . . .	16	19	21	11	12	15	11	18	27	8	16	14	16	16	17	16	16	17
Disagree . . . . .	77	77	77	84	84	79	81	67	65	88	84	80	77	77	78	79	73	77
Did not state . . . . .	2	2	—	2	1	2	5	4	5	2	—	—	2	2	—	2	4	2
Magazines:																		
Agree strongly . . . . .	17	11	14	16	20	14	23	22	16	18	10	19	16	16	14	15	21	16
Agree somewhat . . . . .	33	42	36	48	24	29	17	34	35	37	39	35	33	32	34	35	30	35
Disagree . . . . .	44	42	48	35	47	51	50	36	43	39	47	43	45	45	50	45	40	43
Did not state . . . . .	6	5	2	1	9	6	10	8	6	6	4	3	6	7	2	5	9	6
Contribute to Feeling Canada will break apart																		
Newspapers:																		
Agree strongly . . . . .	21	16	13	18	24	16	30	34	22	16	2	22	21	21	22	20	21	20
Agree somewhat . . . . .	37	39	43	50	44	33	33	33	41	42	57	37	37	36	38	36	37	37

Disagree . . . . .	41	45	42	32	30	50	35	32	37	41	41	41	42	36	40	43	40	42	41
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	2	—	2	1	2	1	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	1	2	1	—
Television:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	15	11	9	18	21	11	16	24	11	11	12	14	14	19	14	15	16	15	15
Agree somewhat . . . . .	31	36	42	44	37	25	20	33	27	47	35	32	31	31	32	32	31	31	32
Disagree . . . . .	52	53	49	38	42	63	61	42	60	41	53	54	52	48	53	53	51	53	51
Did not state . . . . .	2	—	—	—	—	1	3	1	2	1	—	—	1	2	1	—	2	1	2
Radio:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	8	6	6	4	4	5	7	16	5	1	4	9	7	9	7	7	9	7	8
Agree somewhat . . . . .	27	27	30	29	35	22	24	30	24	35	29	26	27	28	29	29	23	26	27
Disagree . . . . .	63	66	63	65	60	72	66	51	62	61	67	64	64	59	64	63	64	64	63
Did not state . . . . .	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	3	9	3	—	1	2	4	—	1	4	3	2
Magazines:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	11	8	9	7	15	9	9	16	3	4	2	11	11	13	10	9	13	11	10
Agree somewhat . . . . .	33	39	37	40	28	28	35	34	41	42	37	32	33	35	38	32	31	32	34
Disagree . . . . .	50	47	50	50	48	57	45	41	51	48	55	55	49	48	49	53	46	50	49
Did not state . . . . .	6	6	4	3	9	6	11	9	5	6	6	2	7	4	3	6	10	7	7
Contribute to Strong Family Relationship																			
Newspapers:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	10	6	6	8	11	9	8	12	5	11	10	15	9	11	5	8	14	10	9
Agree somewhat . . . . .	31	26	36	36	37	29	33	30	27	30	39	36	30	32	25	32	33	29	33
Disagree . . . . .	58	67	58	55	50	61	56	56	65	57	51	49	60	56	68	60	51	59	58
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	—	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	—	—	1	1	2	—	2	2	—
Television:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	17	11	13	10	17	17	31	20	14	13	14	16	17	19	11	16	18	16	18
Agree somewhat . . . . .	37	37	38	39	44	36	28	35	46	46	51	35	37	39	30	34	38	36	38
Disagree . . . . .	44	52	48	51	37	45	36	44	40	41	35	49	45	41	56	46	42	46	43
Did not state . . . . .	2	—	1	—	2	2	5	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	3	1	2	2	1
Radio:																			
Agree strongly . . . . .	10	5	10	9	10	9	11	15	8	10	8	15	10	12	6	9	14	11	10
Agree somewhat . . . . .	37	33	39	46	52	35	33	34	41	35	55	43	36	38	31	32	37	35	38
Disagree . . . . .	50	61	51	44	37	53	50	48	43	53	37	42	52	48	59	53	43	51	50
Did not state . . . . .	3	1	—	1	1	3	6	3	8	2	—	—	2	2	4	1	5	3	2

Table 28. Opinion on Social Influence of Media Content Question 32a,b,c,d) — Continued  
% of individuals

	Province*										Community		Education		Age		Sex			
	Quebec										Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.										Nfld.
Magazines:																				
Agree strongly	7	5	6	4	11	7	5	8	3	2	8	6	7	7	5	7	5	9	7	7
Agree somewhat	31	37	33	32	24	32	27	29	27	27	39	41	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
Disagree	56	52	60	62	55	55	57	55	65	65	51	51	56	55	59	59	58	51	56	56
Did not state	6	6	1	2	10	6	11	8	5	6	2	2	7	7	5	3	6	9	6	6
Contribute to Feeling Divorce Is Acceptable																				
Newspapers:																				
Agree strongly	29	21	22	21	27	25	35	44	14	18	27	26	30	29	29	25	28	34	27	32
Agree somewhat	38	42	39	44	49	40	32	33	27	30	44	44	37	37	40	37	38	38	39	37
Disagree	32	36	39	34	22	34	31	22	57	51	29	29	32	32	29	38	34	26	33	31
Did not state	1	1	—	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	—	1	1	2	2	—	—	2	1	—
Television:																				
Agree strongly	33	35	27	29	40	30	28	39	14	29	22	35	32	33	32	23	31	39	31	35
Agree somewhat	37	32	41	42	38	38	33	36	41	41	59	41	37	36	42	42	37	37	39	36
Disagree	29	32	31	29	21	30	35	25	43	30	18	23	29	30	23	35	32	22	29	29
Did not state	1	1	1	—	1	2	4	—	2	—	1	1	2	1	3	—	—	2	1	—
Radio:																				
Agree strongly	13	13	10	4	11	12	14	23	8	4	—	12	14	13	14	10	11	18	11	16
Agree somewhat	29	33	30	25	38	26	26	30	14	23	47	35	28	28	29	27	27	31	31	26
Disagree	56	54	59	69	51	60	56	44	73	72	53	52	56	57	53	62	59	48	56	56
Did not state	2	—	1	2	—	2	4	3	5	1	—	1	2	2	4	1	3	3	2	2

# Magazines:

Agree strongly	30	33	25	26	35	24	29	40	19	28	27	32	30	30	31	27	35	29	31
Agree somewhat	38	40	49	49	30	39	43	31	35	45	55	45	38	37	42	38	41	38	39
Disagree	25	21	25	23	26	30	19	21	41	22	16	20	26	26	23	32	27	21	24
Did not state	7	6	1	2	9	7	9	8	5	5	2	3	6	7	4	3	5	9	6

# Are Society's Conscience

## Newspapers:

Agree strongly	22	14	20	17	22	22	21	27	32	12	16	25	21	23	19	21	20	25	23
Agree somewhat	43	52	47	52	55	43	40	34	27	48	41	46	43	43	40	39	44	43	40
Disagree	34	34	30	31	23	34	37	38	38	39	43	28	35	33	39	40	35	29	35
Did not state	1	—	3	—	—	1	2	1	3	1	—	1	1	1	2	—	1	3	2

## Television:

Agree strongly	15	12	11	12	10	13	12	22	5	8	16	17	14	15	12	15	13	17	14
Agree somewhat	38	39	37	46	44	36	32	38	41	40	47	36	39	40	31	41	36	39	37
Disagree	46	49	50	42	46	49	52	40	51	51	37	47	46	44	55	44	50	42	48
Did not state	1	—	2	—	—	2	4	—	3	1	—	—	1	1	2	—	1	2	1

## Radio:

Agree strongly	11	9	7	12	10	10	7	14	8	13	8	15	10	12	8	11	9	13	10
Agree somewhat	38	39	39	41	55	38	34	33	27	29	51	39	38	38	35	37	38	38	38
Disagree	49	51	53	46	34	50	54	50	60	55	41	46	50	48	53	52	51	45	50
Did not state	2	1	1	1	1	2	5	3	5	3	—	—	2	2	4	—	2	4	2

## Magazines:

Agree strongly	10	8	5	4	13	9	10	15	8	5	10	12	10	10	10	10	8	13	10
Agree somewhat	34	45	42	46	36	35	25	25	24	31	45	37	34	34	33	32	36	33	32
Disagree	49	42	51	49	42	49	55	51	62	58	41	48	50	49	53	54	51	45	51
Did not state	7	5	2	1	9	7	10	9	6	6	4	3	6	7	4	4	5	9	7

## Remind of Responsibilities to Less Fortunate

### Newspapers:

Agree strongly	33	25	29	32	40	37	32	30	22	39	25	39	33	34	32	28	32	39	31
Agree somewhat	46	61	53	53	49	48	43	33	60	46	50	44	46	46	47	42	48	46	46
Disagree	20	14	18	15	10	13	24	37	18	15	25	16	21	20	20	29	20	15	22
Did not state	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	1



Table 28. Opinion on Social Influence of Media Content (Question 32a,b,c,d) — *Continued*  
 % of individuals

	Province*										Community		Education		Age		Sex		
	Quebec										Urban	Rural	High school or less	College	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.									
Television:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Agree strongly	35	18	34	50	40	36	25	33	38	52	47	39	35	38	35	33	39	32	38
Agree somewhat	43	64	48	44	50	44	40	32	46	41	47	43	43	42	46	41	46	40	43
Disagree	20	18	14	5	8	17	29	34	16	7	4	16	20	19	23	23	19	18	22
Did not state	2	—	4	1	2	3	6	1	—	—	2	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	1
Radio:																			
Agree strongly	29	21	23	34	39	28	16	32	30	31	31	35	28	31	22	25	26	34	27
Agree somewhat	47	63	58	53	51	49	51	33	51	48	51	48	47	47	50	43	50	46	47
Disagree	22	15	18	11	10	21	29	32	11	19	18	17	22	21	24	31	22	16	22
Did not state	2	1	1	2	—	2	4	3	8	2	—	—	3	1	4	1	2	4	3
Magazines:																			
Agree strongly	18	14	19	18	23	18	14	19	16	21	14	22	17	19	15	17	17	20	18
Agree somewhat	47	60	57	53	43	51	43	33	57	43	53	51	47	46	54	44	50	45	44
Disagree	29	21	22	27	25	25	33	41	22	30	29	25	29	29	28	35	29	26	32
Did not state	6	5	2	2	9	6	10	7	5	6	4	2	7	6	3	4	4	9	6

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## NEWSPAPERS AND RADIO – FOR WHOM?

*Table 29.* There is something in a newspaper that will interest anyone who can read say the respondents.

"There is something for everyone."

"There are a great variety of articles, advertising, sports, etc."

"Most everybody can read. It doesn't matter if you are intelligent or not."

"If you can read you will likely read the newspaper."

"People read what they want to and the rest they don't bother with."

"We are all interested."

**Table 29. Opinion on Audience for Newspapers and Radio (Questions 33 and 34)**

% of individuals

Medium and audience	Total	Province*									
		B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.
							Eng.	Fr.			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Newspapers For</i>											
Highly intelligent . . . . .	1	1	—	2	1	1	3	1	—	—	2
Fairly intelligent . . . . .	7	6	7	8	11	8	11	7	3	1	12
Everybody . . . . .	91	93	93	90	88	91	85	92	97	99	86
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
<i>Radio For</i>											
Highly intelligent . . . . .	—	1	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	—
Fairly intelligent . . . . .	3	3	2	—	4	4	2	2	—	1	—
Everybody . . . . .	97	96	98	98	94	95	97	98	100	99	100
Did not state . . . . .	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL, AND LOCAL NEWS

*Table 30.* Most people who find international news more interesting emphasize that they consider international events more important or of more ultimate consequence in their lives.

"There are the events that will ultimately affect our economy and our lives."

"It's what's happening around the world and not just here in our local area."

"Local news is all accidents and trouble. Being born in another country maybe I'm more aware of the effects of international happenings which are of more importance."

People who prefer national news generally give as their reason that as a Canadian they want to know more about what is happening in their country.

"I am a Canadian citizen and I am interested in Canada."

"It covers the things you are interested about."

"Because I am a nationalist I am interested in living in one country."

"I am interested in everything that goes on in my country."

People who are more interested in local news are inclined to feel that things close at hand are more meaningful or easier to understand.

"Local news is easy to understand - it isn't too elaborate."

"The things that are closer to us are the most interesting."

"What goes on somewhere else does not concern us."

"Because I am living with it. It is about people and a town that you know."

"It's the news of what we see and hear most often."

Table 30. International, National, Local News – Credibility, Preferences, Interests, and Balance (Questions 35a,b; 36a,b)  
% of individuals

Opinion of media handling of types of news	Province*										Community		Education		Age		Sex			
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec				Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female	
							Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.										Nfld.
<i>News Trusted Most</i>																				
International . . . . .	26	28	28	18	11	24	30	30	24	28	33	20	26	25	27	28	27	23	25	27
National . . . . .	24	26	22	27	28	30	25	14	38	24	29	20	25	24	27	19	26	25	26	23
Local . . . . .	46	39	45	51	59	41	38	54	30	47	37	56	45	48	39	51	42	48	49	47
Not stated . . . . .	4	7	5	4	2	5	7	2	8	1	1	4	4	3	7	2	5	4	—	3
<i>News Most Interested In</i>																				
International . . . . .	32	46	35	23	26	32	52	28	14	27	39	22	34	29	44	38	32	29	35	29
National . . . . .	22	19	17	26	28	25	17	19	32	27	20	20	22	21	27	18	22	24	23	21
Local . . . . .	43	30	43	46	44	41	31	52	54	46	39	55	42	48	24	43	43	44	39	47
Not stated . . . . .	3	5	5	5	2	2	—	1	—	—	2	3	2	2	5	1	3	3	3	3
<i>Prefer To See More Of</i>																				
International . . . . .	29	35	35	23	21	28	45	27	14	24	35	21	30	26	39	38	28	25	30	27
National . . . . .	35	28	22	39	42	31	24	45	38	43	28	43	33	39	17	34	35	35	33	36
Local . . . . .	30	27	33	33	32	32	27	25	35	27	37	28	30	28	35	24	31	31	30	29
Not stated . . . . .	6	10	10	5	5	9	4	3	13	6	—	8	7	7	9	4	6	9	7	8
<i>Think Good Balance Of News Now</i>																				
Yes . . . . .	72	71	78	70	73	69	74	75	78	71	78	73	73	75	64	63	71	79	72	73

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

*Table 31.* About one-half of the people who believe that the news is controlled vaguely refer to "them" as being responsible for these controls.

"They do not tell us all."

"We know there are some things the press can't print."

"There is much more real news than is ever presented."

"Some things can't be told for obvious reasons."

"I don't know why, I just feel it is."

"I've heard that they cut the bad parts out."

"They won't let them print what they want."

"What is happening is controlled by whoever is doing it."

Big business is accused by many to be the controlling influence.

"Big business has the final word."

"I believe that otherwise the big corporations wouldn't invest."

As many accuse government or the military of controlling the news.

"The government has more to say about it than we do."

"War news is not always true fact."

"Some information is authentic but the ones concerning the government are controlled."

The selective function in a newspaper is viewed by some as a form of control. Some view this as a constructive and useful function to eliminate slander and other excesses. Others view it as a slanting of information.

"It is controlled by the good work of editors and journalists."

"They cannot write everything—the newspapers must use some diplomacy."

"The publisher censors things."

"The newspaper editors censor to prevent abuses and to maintain their popularity."

Table 31. Opinion on Whether News is Managed or Unmanaged (Question 37)  
% of individuals

News is managed	Province*										Annual income						
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000
							Eng.	Fr.									
Yes . . . . .	69	72	74	61	63	64	59	74	84	87	59	70	69	73	64	67	60
No . . . . .	29	25	25	35	37	34	40	22	16	12	35	26	29	26	33	33	37
Did not state . . . . .	2	3	1	4	—	2	1	4	—	1	6	4	2	1	3	—	3

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 32. Section of Newspaper Preferred (Question 38)

Average amount of time in minutes

Time spent on section	Province*										Education		Age		Sex			
	Quebec										High school							
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	or less	College	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
Front page . . . . .	7	8	7	6	7	7	7	5	6	7	4	7	7	5	6	8	7	6
Financial section . . . . .	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	4	2	3	3	4	2
Editorials . . . . .	6	6	6	4	6	6	7	5	4	6	4	6	7	4	5	7	6	6
International news . . . . .	7	7	7	5	6	7	8	8	7	6	4	7	8	7	6	7	7	6
Woman's section . . . . .	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	4	5	5	2	7
Want ads . . . . .	4	4	5	3	4	4	2	2	5	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Sports . . . . .	5	4	5	4	7	5	4	5	6	6	4	5	4	5	5	5	7	3
Travel . . . . .	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	4	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Other . . . . .	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	4

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



*Table 33.* Those who would like to see more editorial comment generally comment that editorials provide a background and perspective to the news that helps them to form a more mature opinion.

"I think it gives you the truest picture of the news."

"The editorial page gives you more ideas than the rest of the paper."

"The editorial section is usually interesting and helps one to form opinions."

Most people who are satisfied with the current level of editorial comment either state that they find there is enough to read now or that it doesn't matter because they spend only a limited amount of time with this section anyway.

"I read it only a few times."

"I don't involve my life that much in the paper anyway."

"It's not the quantity that matters."

"I'm not too concerned. There's enough."

People who want less editorial comment indicate that they do not read editorials.

Table 33. Opinion on Amount of Editorial Comment Currently in Newspapers (Question 39)  
% of individuals

Amount of editorial comment preferred	Province*										Education		Sex		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld. or less	High school College	Male	Female	
							Eng.	Fr.							
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
More . . . . .	20	14	18	23	21	22	19	20	8	24	20	19	26	23	18
Same . . . . .	65	68	65	57	65	65	72	67	73	61	59	66	63	61	70
Less . . . . .	9	13	11	12	9	8	3	7	5	8	18	9	8	11	7
Did not state . . . . .	6	5	6	8	5	5	6	6	14	7	3	6	3	5	5

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## NEWSMAGAZINES

Table 34. Audience for Newsmagazines (Question 40a)  
% of individuals

Take newsmagazine	Province*													Community			Education			Annual income			Age		
	Quebec																								
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
Yes . . . . .	39	31	42	39	30	35	51	45	32	36	45	36	39	34	57	31	30	34	40	45	62	50	37	38	36
No . . . . .	61	69	57	61	70	64	49	55	68	61	55	63	60	66	42	68	69	65	60	55	38	49	62	61	63
Did not state . . . . .	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	3	—	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 35. Newsmagazine Preferred (Question 40b)**  
% of individuals who get a newsmagazine

Newsmagazine taken	Province*										Community		Education	Annual income				Age							
	Quebec																								
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
Time . . . . .	51	70	65	67	67	57	73	18	68	54	68	34	53	45	63	37	38	48	57	62	56	63	50	48	
Newsweek . . . . .	8	11	10	5	12	11	8	2	8	10	9	9	7	6	11	4	10	8	5	9	11	3	3	8	10
Other . . . . .	29	13	25	27	21	25	12	48	24	20	18	41	29	34	20	34	42	33	28	18	20	32	19	29	31
Did not state . . . . .	12	6	-	1	-	7	7	32	-	16	5	16	11	15	6	25	10	1	10	6	7	9	15	13	11

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# MEDIA FOR NEWS AND ENTERTAINMENT

Table 36. Opinion on News and Entertainment Value of Media (Question 41)  
% of individuals †

Reasons for choice of medium	Province*										Community		Education	Annual income					Age						
	Quebec										Urban	Rural	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.															
<i>Facts</i>																									
Television . . . . .	34	29	22	33	17	27	35	52	43	28	37	31	34	36	24	42	39	35	31	28	20	33	41	35	29
Radio . . . . .	18	24	20	22	20	17	24	13	16	30	8	23	17	18	17	20	18	16	17	16	11	18	17	21	
Newspapers . . . . .	47	43	49	43	63	54	49	36	38	39	55	46	47	46	53	38	44	45	52	56	54	46	37	45	52
Magazines . . . . .	10	15	19	15	13	10	10	3	8	15	6	10	10	8	18	6	6	9	7	17	20	16	8	11	8
<i>Special Reports</i>																									
Television . . . . .	62	58	49	56	40	66	53	69	78	52	65	55	63	63	58	60	62	66	67	58	57	63	72	66	54
Radio . . . . .	25	21	38	30	34	25	33	14	22	36	22	31	24	26	19	29	28	24	22	23	18	19	20	22	30
Newspapers . . . . .	13	18	13	11	22	11	20	15	—	10	6	17	13	13	16	13	13	12	12	16	18	8	7	12	18
Magazines . . . . .	7	6	9	9	13	5	8	7	—	5	4	5	7	4	15	3	4	4	7	11	13	5	7	6	5
<i>Background</i>																									
Television . . . . .	27	18	15	18	17	22	29	44	27	31	27	23	27	30	15	36	31	27	24	21	20	26	32	27	25
Radio . . . . .	14	18	13	17	6	11	15	18	14	17	8	15	14	15	11	15	16	14	12	14	11	11	11	14	16
Newspapers . . . . .	43	43	45	45	57	48	45	36	32	37	37	48	43	43	44	41	42	45	47	47	37	35	36	42	48
Magazines . . . . .	18	20	30	26	26	21	23	4	16	18	27	16	19	14	33	8	14	16	19	25	35	31	24	20	19
<i>Interpretation</i>																									
Television . . . . .	37	33	25	29	22	33	38	54	22	31	35	35	37	40	25	42	45	40	36	29	27	39	44	39	32
Radio . . . . .	13	13	14	14	9	11	19	11	16	22	16	12	12	13	11	12	16	11	12	15	8	11	7	13	14

Table 36. Opinion on News and Entertainment Value of Media (Question 41) - Continued  
% of individuals †

Reasons for choice of medium	Province*										Community			Education	Annual income						Age					
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban		High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
							Eng.	Fr.																		
<i>Entertainment</i>																										
Newspapers	41	40	44	40	57	46	41	34	35	37	33	42	42	40	48	39	34	41	44	46	47	34	35	40	47	8
Magazines	12	17	15	19	18	13	13	5	8	12	16	12	12	9	22	7	11	12	20	23	20	14	13	8		
<i>Relaxation</i>																										
Television	81	84	83	88	77	81	76	76	92	81	90	83	81	82	76	82	81	82	82	80	76	76	82	83	79	
Radio	12	16	15	13	16	11	21	7	8	17	6	12	12	11	13	15	13	10	9	13	13	15	14	11	12	
Newspapers	10	4	10	2	9	9	13	17	5	5	2	7	10	9	12	6	10	12	11	11	11	10	9	9	12	
Magazines	3	4	6	4	2	4	4	2	-	6	2	3	3	3	6	2	2	3	3	4	7	6	2	4	2	
<i>Relaxation</i>																										
Television	68	70	71	77	62	66	56	73	87	59	71	69	69	69	65	71	70	69	66	70	66	66	69	69	68	
Radio	24	26	29	23	30	26	35	19	8	33	16	27	24	24	27	23	21	24	26	25	28	29	25	25	22	
Newspapers	6	5	5	3	8	6	13	6	3	6	8	4	7	7	6	6	9	5	7	4	7	3	6	6	8	
Magazines	7	8	6	5	10	8	8	4	3	11	6	6	7	6	10	4	6	7	9	6	8	8	6	8	5	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

† Combined media percentages may add to more than 100% because of multiple mentions.



## Table 37. Regularity of TV Newswatching (Question 42)

% of individuals

Time spent watching TV news	Province*										Community		Education	Annual income				Age							
											Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	Quebec																
Daily	68	68	53	68	67	66	66	76	92	72	82	64	69	70	63	74	70	70	66	67	61	53	62	69	75
Three times a week	18	15	30	20	21	18	19	16	3	17	11	21	18	18	20	14	17	18	21	17	19	25	23	19	14
Once a week	8	9	9	7	7	9	6	5	3	6	6	8	7	8	5	8	7	8	9	10	14	8	7	6	6
Other	4	5	4	4	5	8	3	2	2	2	-	4	4	4	7	3	4	3	4	6	7	6	5	3	5
Did not state	2	3	3	1	2	1	-	-	-	3	1	3	2	-	2	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	-

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 38. TV Networks Watched Most Often (Question 43)

% of individuals

TV network preferred	Province*										
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec				
							Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
American network											
ABC, CBS, NBC . . . . .	11	35	2	2	3	16	8	1	5	1	—
CBC . . . . .	56	48	54	82	81	56	53	46	62	64	67
CTV . . . . .	28	15	38	17	13	23	33	53	32	33	33
Other and did not state . . . . .	5	2	6	6	3	5	6	—	1	2	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 39. Favourite Newsmen (Question 44)

Favourite Newsmen	% of individuals who mention a favourite newscaster
<i>English Speaking Canadians</i>	
Walter Cronkite . . . . .	15
Stanley Burke . . . . .	11
Harvey Kirck . . . . .	7
Lloyd Robertson . . . . .	5
Huntley & Brinkley . . . . .	4
Earl Cameron . . . . .	3
Jim McLeod . . . . .	2
Other . . . . .	13
no preference stated . . . . .	40
	100
<i>French Speaking Canadians</i>	
Gaëtan Montreuil . . . . .	10
Pierre Nadeau . . . . .	10
Roger Gosselin . . . . .	9
Gaëtan Barrette . . . . .	4
Gilles Chevette . . . . .	4
France Fortin . . . . .	4
Noël Gauthier . . . . .	4
Mario Verdon . . . . .	3
Michel Vinet . . . . .	3
Henry Bergeron . . . . .	3
Réal Giguère . . . . .	2
Jacques Fauteux . . . . .	2
Raymond Lemay . . . . .	2
André Duquette . . . . .	2
Other . . . . .	16
no preference stated . . . . .	22
	100

# CREDIBILITY OF TV CAMERA

**Table 40. Opinion on Reliability of TV Camera (Question 45a)**

% of individuals

TV camera can lie	Province*												Commu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income							Sex		
	Quebec												Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Male	Female
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.													
Yes . . . . .	66	77	61	68	54	69	63	58	65	75	69	62	66	62	79	60	58	68	69	69	73	69	62	
No . . . . .	32	20	37	29	45	29	35	41	32	22	31	37	32	36	20	38	40	31	29	30	26	29	36	
Did not state	2	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	—	1	2	—	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 41. Reaction to Unreliability of TV Camera (Question 45b)**

% of individuals who feel TV camera lies

Frightened	Total	Province*										Commu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income						Sex			
		B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec				Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Male	Female
							Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.													
Yes . . . . .	37	45	47	30	48	36	52	38	17	18	9	36	38	34	48	33	33	36	35	35	50	36	40
No . . . . .	63	54	53	70	50	64	48	62	83	82	91	64	62	66	52	67	67	64	65	65	50	64	60
Did not state	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# RESPONSES TO MEDIA

Table 42. Opinions on Effects of Various Media (Question 46)  
% of individuals

Effects of media	Province*										Community						Age																	
	Total		B.C.		Alta.		Sask.		Man.		Ont.		Quebec		N.B.		N.S.		Nfld.		Rural		Urban		Under 20		20-24		25-44		Over 44			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%			
<i>Most Immediate</i>																																		
Television . . . . .	37	32	26	28	30	38	31	42	41	28	43	28	37	36	41	37	35																	
Radio . . . . .	59	66	69	70	69	59	62	48	57	70	55	68	58	53	54	60	60																	
Newspapers . . . . .	4	1	5	2	1	2	5	10	2	2	2	4	5	11	3	3	5																	
Not stated . . . . .	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—																	
<i>Exciting</i>																																		
Television . . . . .	92	90	94	97	93	93	90	91	95	93	94	93	92	89	91	94	91																	
Radio . . . . .	4	6	3	1	4	4	4	4	5	6	6	4	4	3	6	3	5																	
Newspapers . . . . .	3	2	3	2	3	3	6	5	—	—	—	3	3	8	2	3	3																	
Not stated . . . . .	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—																	
<i>Most Personal</i>																																		
Television . . . . .	35	36	49	32	47	35	29	29	46	30	35	35	35	28	30	34	38																	
Radio . . . . .	18	23	15	14	9	15	23	22	16	24	14	18	18	14	20	17	19																	
Newspapers . . . . .	45	38	34	53	44	48	46	48	38	41	49	44	45	57	48	46	40																	
Not stated . . . . .	2	3	2	1	—	2	2	1	—	5	2	3	2	1	2	3	3																	
<i>Most Private</i>																																		
Television . . . . .	17	14	19	11	11	16	19	23	22	7	16	19	16	20	21	16	16																	
Radio . . . . .	25	29	24	23	23	25	16	27	32	40	25	24	26	22	29	26	26																	
Newspapers . . . . .	53	53	51	60	62	53	59	49	41	46	55	53	53	58	46	54	52																	
Not stated . . . . .	5	4	6	6	4	6	6	1	5	7	4	4	5	—	4	4	6																	
<i>Most Influential</i>																																		
Television . . . . .	66	65	65	78	58	60	67	78	70	49	74	66	67	62	71	71	61																	
Radio . . . . .	6	7	5	2	9	5	7	3	3	18	10	4	6	6	7	4	7																	
Newspapers . . . . .	27	26	28	20	32	33	24	18	27	31	14	30	26	32	20	24	30																	
Not stated . . . . .	1	2	2	—	1	2	2	1	—	2	2	—	1	—	2	2	1																	

## CHILDREN UNDER TEN AND TV

*Table 43.* Eight in ten (79 per cent) Canadians believe that television is the best means by which their children (under 10) should acquire information. They say that it is the easiest media for young people to understand.

"It is the only means for information at their age."

"They can't read the newspapers and can't understand the radio."

"They are too lazy to read and they like something they can see."

"Talking pictures have more effect on children."

"Their imagination is more captivated by this medium; it touches sound senses."

The reason most frequently given for preferring newspapers is that there is more of a follow-up with newspapers and articles that can be saved.

**Table 43. Number of Individuals with Children Under Ten and Number of Hours Children Allowed to Spend Watching TV (Question 47a,b)**

% of individuals

	Province*																Com mu- nity	Education	Annual income				
	Quebec																						
Discourage children from watching	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000							
Per cent with children under ten . . . . .	43	43	54	44	40	43	35	41	30	54	47	47	43	43	44	27	43	51	50	46	41		
Average hours of watching per wk† . . .	12	11	12	12	12	12	9	12	15	13	13	13	12	12	10	13	13	12	12	11	11		
Discourage children from watching																							
Yes . . . . .	37	44	37	22	57	43	46	28	18	34	26	44	37	34	49	30	28	33	44	37	55		
No . . . . .	63	56	63	78	43	57	54	72	82	66	74	56	63	66	51	70	72	67	56	63	45		

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

†Median is also about 12 hrs per wk.; i.e. 50% watch more, 50% watch less

Table 44. Opinion on Best Source of Information for Children (Question 47d)  
% of individuals

Best source of information for children	Province*																		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec					Nfld.	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	
							Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.									
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
TV . . . . .	79	77	72	71	74	67	83	92	83	86	67	83	84	79	77	75	67		
Radio . . . . .	3	1	2	—	3	2	2	3	—	5	7	4	2	1	4	3	3		
Newspapers . . . . .	18	22	26	29	23	30	15	5	17	9	26	13	14	20	19	22	30		

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



Table 45. Opinion on Whether or Not Certain Subjects Ought to be Shown on TV and What Moral Effect Showings would have (Question 48a,b)  
% of individuals

Item to be shown or not shown and opinion of effect of showing	Province*												Community		Education		Age		Sex	
	Quebec						High school						Under 25		College 25-44		Over 44		Male	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Cartoons of People</i>																				
<i>Throwing Pies at Each Other</i>																				
Should be shown . . . . .	69	72	75	81	64	74	76	51	57	88	82	68	69	69	68	71	72	63	73	64
Should not be shown . . . . .	31	28	23	18	36	25	24	49	43	12	18	32	31	31	31	28	28	36	26	36
Not stated . . . . .	—	—	2	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	1	—
<i>Breakdown morality</i>																				
Do not breakdown morality . . .	13	14	17	6	24	12	13	14	8	12	8	12	13	13	11	13	11	17	11	15
Not stated . . . . .	86	86	82	94	76	87	86	86	92	88	90	87	86	86	87	87	89	82	88	84
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	2	1	1	1	2	—	—	1	1	1
<i>War Stories</i>																				
Should be shown . . . . .	60	65	55	62	62	70	77	37	57	72	84	57	61	60	62	68	61	55	64	57
Should not be shown . . . . .	39	35	45	36	37	28	23	62	43	28	16	42	39	40	36	31	39	44	35	43
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	—	2	1	2	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	1	—	1	1	—
<i>Breakdown morality</i>																				
Do not breakdown morality . . .	35	31	39	36	34	30	28	47	30	30	29	40	35	35	35	32	36	36	33	38
Not stated . . . . .	63	68	59	63	65	68	71	53	68	70	71	58	64	64	63	67	63	62	66	61
Not stated . . . . .	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	—	2	—	—	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
<i>Fights in Hockey Game</i>																				
Should be shown . . . . .	63	61	66	66	59	66	72	49	70	76	88	64	62	62	65	69	64	57	65	60
Should not be shown . . . . .	36	37	33	33	40	33	27	51	30	23	12	36	37	37	34	31	35	41	34	39
Not stated . . . . .	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	1	1	1	—	1	2	1	1
<i>Breakdown morality</i>																				
Do not breakdown morality . . .	31	34	33	37	39	34	24	29	27	23	12	26	32	31	32	26	29	37	29	33
Not stated . . . . .	67	66	65	63	61	64	74	71	65	77	88	73	67	68	67	74	69	61	70	65
Not stated . . . . .	2	—	2	—	—	2	2	—	8	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	2	2	1	2

Table 45. Opinion on Whether or Not Certain Subjects Ought to be Shown on TV and What Moral Effect Showings would have (Question 48a,b) — *Continued*

% of individuals

Item to be shown or not shown and opinion of effect of showing	Province*												Community		Education		Age		Sex	
															High school		Under		Over	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	%	%	25	25-44	44	Male	Female
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Players Disobeying Referee</i>																				
Should be shown . . . . .	49	47	57	56	46	51	59	37	49	59	69	47	49	47	55	57	51	42	50	48
Should not be shown . . . . .	51	53	42	44	53	48	40	63	51	41	31	53	51	52	45	42	49	57	49	52
Not stated . . . . .	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	1	—
Breakdown morality . . . . .	45	51	49	44	52	47	31	42	54	42	29	42	46	45	45	39	43	51	43	47
Do not breakdown morality . . . . .	54	49	50	56	48	51	67	57	38	58	71	58	53	54	53	60	56	48	56	53
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	1	—	—	2	2	1	8	—	—	—	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	—
<i>Mother and Father Fighting</i>																				
Should be shown . . . . .	28	35	34	45	30	35	35	10	19	33	22	26	29	26	39	33	26	35	28	29
Should not be shown . . . . .	71	65	66	55	70	64	65	89	81	67	78	74	71	74	60	67	73	65	71	71
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—
Breakdown morality . . . . .	67	61	65	60	63	60	57	80	84	70	80	70	67	69	58	69	63	70	67	66
Do not breakdown morality . . . . .	32	39	33	40	37	38	41	19	14	30	20	29	32	30	40	30	36	28	31	33
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	2	—	—	2	2	1	2	—	—	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1
<i>Boy Fighting Policeman</i>																				
Should be shown . . . . .	19	22	22	24	26	21	34	9	8	16	22	14	20	16	29	29	20	13	21	17
Should not be shown . . . . .	80	78	77	75	74	78	66	90	92	84	78	86	80	83	70	71	80	86	78	83
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	—
Breakdown morality . . . . .	75	76	74	79	71	74	60	77	87	81	74	77	75	76	70	71	76	76	74	77
Do not breakdown morality . . . . .	24	24	25	20	29	25	39	23	13	19	26	22	24	23	28	29	23	23	26	23
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	1	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	2	—	1	1	1	—

# *Sniffing Glue*

Should be shown . . . . .	10	10	7	11	14	12	18	5	5	8	8	5	10	9	13	13	11	6	12	7
Should not be shown . . . . .	90	90	91	89	85	88	81	94	95	92	92	94	89	91	86	86	89	93	88	92
Not stated . . . . .	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	1
Breakdown morality . . . . .	82	85	87	91	82	82	70	81	89	86	86	87	82	84	79	80	82	83	82	83
Do not breakdown morality . . . . .	17	14	12	9	18	17	29	19	11	14	14	12	17	16	20	20	17	16	17	16
Not stated . . . . .	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1

# *Students Rioting*

Should be shown . . . . .	30	50	41	34	24	33	42	15	22	27	31	23	31	26	43	44	31	21	34	26
Should not be shown . . . . .	70	50	59	65	76	66	56	85	78	73	69	76	69	74	56	55	69	78	66	74
Not stated . . . . .	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-
Breakdown morality . . . . .	71	66	67	73	76	71	54	72	84	80	78	77	70	73	61	60	72	75	68	73
Do not breakdown morality . . . . .	28	34	31	27	24	28	43	27	16	19	20	23	29	26	36	38	27	24	31	26
Not stated . . . . .	1	-	2	-	-	1	3	1	-	1	2	-	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1

# *Man and Woman Making Love*

Should be shown . . . . .	28	32	20	32	17	28	49	29	24	13	37	29	28	28	29	40	26	25	32	24
Should not be shown . . . . .	70	67	78	65	83	71	50	70	76	87	61	68	71	71	69	59	73	73	67	74
Not stated . . . . .	2	1	2	3	-	1	1	1	-	-	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2
Breakdown morality . . . . .	62	59	69	69	68	62	51	60	70	76	59	60	63	63	61	55	65	63	59	66
Do not breakdown morality . . . . .	36	40	28	29	32	36	46	39	30	22	39	38	36	36	36	44	33	36	39	33
Not stated . . . . .	2	1	3	2	-	2	3	1	-	2	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1

# *Nudity*

Should be shown . . . . .	15	25	7	8	7	15	36	16	11	8	14	8	16	14	20	30	15	8	20	11
Should not be shown . . . . .	84	75	91	91	92	84	63	84	89	92	86	91	83	85	79	69	84	91	79	88
Not stated . . . . .	1	-	2	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Breakdown morality . . . . .	72	64	75	90	80	70	53	72	81	82	82	81	72	74	65	60	73	77	68	76
Do not breakdown morality . . . . .	26	35	23	8	20	27	45	27	19	17	18	17	27	25	33	40	26	21	30	23
Not stated . . . . .	2	1	2	2	-	3	2	1	-	1	-	2	1	1	2	-	1	2	2	1

# *Man Throwing Pie in Someone's Face*

Should be shown . . . . .	53	56	54	58	52	60	69	37	41	63	67	51	53	52	57	58	56	47	57	49
Should not be shown . . . . .	46	43	45	42	48	39	30	62	59	37	33	49	46	47	41	41	44	51	42	50
Not stated . . . . .	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	-	2	1	1

Table 45. Opinion on Whether or Not Certain Subjects Ought to be Shown on TV and What Moral Effect Showings would have (Question 48a,b) - *Continued*  
% of individuals

Item to be shown or not shown and opinion of effect of showing	Province*														Community		Education		Age		Sex	
																	High school		Under		Over	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	or less	College	25	25-44	44	Male	Female		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Breakdown morality . . . . .	25	26	29	27	34	24	18	25	14	28	33	25	26	25	24	22	24	29	24	26		
Do not breakdown morality . . .	74	73	70	73	66	74	80	75	84	71	67	75	74	74	74	78	75	71	75	73		
Not stated . . . . .	1	1	1	—	—	2	2	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	1	—	1	1		
<i>Live Assassination</i>																						
Should be shown . . . . .	34	50	47	41	37	39	42	11	35	40	51	27	35	31	44	41	36	28	36	32		
Should not be shown . . . . .	65	50	52	59	63	60	57	89	65	60	49	73	65	68	55	59	64	71	63	67		
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	1		
Breakdown morality . . . . .	61	47	57	57	54	52	63	82	54	55	63	67	60	63	54	57	61	62	60	61		
Do not breakdown morality . . .	38	52	41	43	46	46	35	18	45	43	37	32	39	37	44	43	38	37	39	38		
Not stated . . . . .	1	1	2	—	—	2	2	—	1	2	—	1	1	—	2	—	1	1	1	1		
<i>Actual Funeral</i>																						
Should be shown . . . . .	71	70	73	76	82	69	76	69	65	66	78	75	70	70	74	62	70	77	72	71		
Should not be shown . . . . .	28	30	26	23	18	30	24	31	35	34	22	25	29	30	25	38	30	22	28	29		
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—		
Breakdown morality . . . . .	18	16	22	18	12	16	17	21	14	17	22	19	17	19	12	24	18	15	18	17		
Do not breakdown morality . . .	81	84	77	82	88	83	81	79	81	82	76	80	82	80	86	75	81	84	81	82		
Not stated . . . . .	1	—	1	—	—	1	2	—	5	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1		

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## TALKING TO TV AND RADIO

*Table 46.* Anger and conflict arising from something said or from an unpleasant commercial are the reasons most often cited for talking to the television or radio.

"Some of these commercials are disgusting."

"If you hear something you don't like, you are going to answer it back."

"I answer when something doesn't make sense to me."

"To answer an announcer."

"If I don't agree I tell him to shut up."

Excitement mainly resulting from watching and listening to sports is the other reason most often cited for talking to the media.

"I just get involved in sports."

"I get riled up or excited in a game."

"The dissatisfaction resulting from an unjust decision by a referee."

**Table 46. Those who Talk to Radio and TV (Question 49a,b)**

% of individuals

Talk to TV and Radio	Province*											Education		Age				
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	High school or less	College	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	
							Eng.	Fr.										
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes . . . . .	37	40	42	50	44	40	26	27	32	49	18	37	38	45	37	39	31	
No . . . . .	63	60	58	50	56	59	73	73	68	49	82	63	62	55	62	60	69	
Did not state . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	
Medium talked to†																		
Radio . . . . .	39	44	35	19	28	48	48	29	34	42	46	36	46	37	41	42	35	
TV . . . . .	67	72	65	82	71	68	71	73	84	58	57	70	65	72	72	69	67	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

†Some totals add to more than 100 because some people talk to both media.

## ADVERTISING

*Table 47.* The positive role is seen mainly as keeping one informed about products.

"Well, if they have something to sell and they advertise it enough they are going to make a go of it."

"If these things weren't advertised we wouldn't know about them."

"The consumer is informed of new products as they come out."

"For making the public aware of new products that require large enough markets for economical production."

"If there was no advertising there would be difficulty promoting products which may be of real value."

"It's the media for information."



Many emphasize that the role is positive only if the advertising is honest (about 20 per cent).

"Positive where advertising is honest. Much advertising is subtle."

"There is a lot of cunning used. . ."

"They should stick to the facts and show life as it really is."

"You sometimes wonder if it will do what they say it will."

A significant number (about 15 per cent, say the positive role is to pay for the media.

"Helps pay for the TV. Otherwise taxes would go up again."

"Someone has to pay for the programming."

"If there was no advertising there would be no TV, radio, or newspapers."

Some emphasize that it makes more production possible.

"It cheapens the price for products due to the vast amounts to be made."

"It achieves economical production."

Most people reason that it is an art form because it demands artistic skills to communicate effectively with people (comment made by about 60 per cent of people who believe advertising is an art form).

"There is an artistic skill involved in the art of photography."

"There is an art to how they get it across to people."

"The more attractive you make it the more people will listen."

"It takes an artistic nature to think up their advertising."

"It is an art to put a product across."

"A person has to know what to do and say to influence people."

Many (about 30 per cent) also emphasize that good advertising can achieve an artistic level that is both stimulating and entertaining.

"If it is done in good taste it can be very entertaining."

"A well-done commercial can be both informative and artistic."

"Some posters are cleverly done. Some cartoon ads are very good and fun to watch."

"One must have very good ideas to influence people; just like a beautiful painting."

14 per cent of Canadians say it isn't an art form and a like number do not know. Most see advertising strictly as a communication to sell goods and services.

"The main concern is to sell a product and not to appeal aesthetically."

"It does not require art to advertise goods for sale."

"Art is lasting, advertising is transitory."

"It's just a merchandising gimmick."

Those who view some newspaper advertising as news generally associate a communication of new information with news.

"An ad telling of an auction or sale may be advertising, but it is news as well."

"Often I am made aware of something new and worthwhile."

"It tells of a good buy sometimes and this is helpful for shoppers."

"I read some of the ads with a view to being informed about new products and price trends."



"It's news if it concerns something we need."  
 "Anything new is news."

People who do not consider advertising as news generally refer to advertising just as a way of pushing products.

"They only want you to buy their products."  
 "It's to sell, that's all."  
 "It's not really news. Most things have been around for quite a while."  
 "Cigarette advertising isn't news to me."  
 "Advertising is commerce, not news."  
 "News is related to people not things."

The worst things that advertising can do to you in the opinion of Canadians are summarized in the following table.

	<i>% of Canadians</i>
It can mislead you . . . . .	32
It can insult your intelligence . . . . .	24
It can bore you/create indifference . . . . .	23
It can persuade you to buy things you shouldn't . . . . .	18
It can exploit sex or violence . . . . .	3

"It misinforms me."  
 "It can make you buy poor products or influence you to believe that through finance companies you can buy anything."  
 "To make me accept something that is false."  
 "To leave me indifferent and suspicious."  
 "To make me spend money I shouldn't."  
 "They certainly exploit a woman's body."  
 "They really make robots out of us."  
 "Too much publicity bores me."  
 "They bore me."

Most complain that there are too many advertisements shown – some suspect the number increases towards the end of the movie – and they are frustrated by the constant interruption to the story.

"There is a tendency to increase the number of ads as the programme progresses."  
 "It gets to the point that you don't want to continue watching."  
 "It's just too extreme – too many ads."  
 "It's shocking, there are too many and I just lose interest."  
 "It is particularly annoying toward the end of the film."  
 "If it wasn't controlled all we would get is advertisements."

The visual and glamorous effects of television advertising are the reasons most often cited for believing that TV is the most persuasive medium.

"The visual picture is apt to be more influencing."  
 "Visual says so much more."  
 "It's more appealing to actually see someone smoking."  
 "The romantic and glamorous situation in commercials can be bad for youngsters."  
 "If they show it with a beautiful girl or handsome boy it is more inviting."  
 "Every time I see it on television I light up one – darn it."

Table 47. Opinions on Various aspects of Advertising (Questions 50 to 61)  
% of individuals

	Province*											Education	Annual income					Age													
Opinions on various aspects of advertising	Quebec											High school or less	College					Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44				
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.		%	%	%	%	%											%	%	%	%
<i>Advertiser controls content</i>																															
Yes . . . . .	33	31	20	19	32	27	28	51	38	30	27	35	25	40	38	32	31	25	24	32	33	28	38								
No . . . . .	65	65	68	79	65	71	68	49	62	64	69	64	71	57	60	65	67	73	74	67	65	69	60								
Did not state . . . . .	2	4	2	2	3	2	4	—	—	6	4	1	4	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	2								
<i>Influenced by advertising</i>																															
A great deal . . . . .	10	8	10	10	10	11	13	10	11	8	12	10	13	7	9	10	14	11	13	15	14	9	10								
Somewhat . . . . .	28	36	42	42	34	32	30	30	28	25	27	28	24	26	26	28	35	31	27	25	30	26									
A little . . . . .	27	19	23	26	28	27	25	33	24	24	35	27	28	26	26	28	25	34	28	30	32	29	24								
Not at all . . . . .	25	21	16	14	21	19	29	38	32	34	22	27	15	34	31	28	20	11	17	17	19	22	30								
I fight it . . . . .	10	16	9	8	7	11	10	9	3	6	9	9	16	9	8	8	13	10	11	11	10	10	10								
<i>Most influential advertising medium</i>																															
TV . . . . .	63	54	69	75	71	61	48	64	73	66	74	64	60	59	66	64	63	65	59	78	77	66	51								
Radio . . . . .	3	4	3	5	3	3	2	3	5	4	—	3	3	5	3	2	5	1	3	5	4	3	3								
Newspapers . . . . .	25	32	23	18	23	29	30	19	13	16	24	24	28	23	20	27	24	29	31	14	15	23	32								
Did not state . . . . .	9	10	5	2	3	7	20	14	3	17	10	9	9	13	11	7	8	5	7	3	4	8	14								
<i>A positive role for advertising</i>																															
Yes . . . . .	84	89	92	84	86	88	90	74	84	80	71	82	90	79	80	81	89	92	89	83	81	84	84								
No . . . . .	14	9	5	16	11	10	8	25	14	18	20	15	9	17	18	18	9	7	9	16	18	14	13								
Did not state . . . . .	2	2	3	—	3	2	2	1	2	2	9	3	1	4	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	3								

Yes	72	81	82	81	85	81	68	45	73	84	78	69	81	65	71	69	74	80	78	73	69	73	78
No	14	19	18	18	14	18	29	53	24	13	18	29	18	32	27	30	26	19	21	26	30	26	28
Did not state	14	—	—	1	1	1	3	2	3	3	4	2	1	3	2	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	2

Ad liked best

Facts only	31	25	25	41	28	30	21	40	27	17	22	33	24	43	33	35	25	22	24	19	31	27	40
Humour	62	68	69	57	68	65	69	52	62	72	72	60	71	48	59	59	69	73	70	74	60	67	53
Suspense	4	2	4	1	2	2	3	7	11	6	4	4	1	5	4	3	4	3	1	5	8	3	3
Other	2	4	2	1	2	2	3	—	—	—	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2
Did not state	1	1	—	—	—	1	4	1	—	5	—	1	1	1	2	1	—	—	2	1	—	1	2

Ads more interesting than program

Yes	33	34	38	37	43	41	35	16	24	45	29	32	39	33	27	30	35	40	38	41	32	33	31
No	66	65	62	62	57	58	63	83	76	53	71	67	60	66	71	69	64	60	61	59	67	66	68
Did not state	1	1	—	1	—	1	2	1	—	2	—	1	1	1	2	1	1	—	1	—	1	1	1

Newspaper advertising news

Yes	51	56	63	67	77	53	45	36	43	58	35	51	52	47	52	52	53	52	47	56	52	49	53
No	48	43	36	33	22	47	55	63	57	39	61	48	47	51	47	48	47	47	53	43	47	50	46
Did not state	1	1	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	3	4	1	1	2	1	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	1

Control for TV movie ads

Yes	92	94	94	92	91	91	92	91	92	93	92	91	93	91	89	92	93	94	94	94	91	92	91
No	7	6	5	8	9	7	7	7	8	6	8	7	6	8	8	8	7	5	5	6	8	7	8
Did not state	1	—	1	—	—	2	1	2	—	1	—	2	1	1	3	—	—	1	1	—	1	1	1

Ads influencing purchasing

ad liked and remembered	61	56	68	55	80	62	42	61	68	58	57	61	62	62	60	60	63	63	64	60	58	60	63
ad disliked and remembered	5	6	3	6	6	6	6	4	—	10	2	4	8	3	4	6	5	5	6	5	6	6	4
Both equal	29	33	24	38	14	28	43	29	30	28	37	30	24	30	31	29	28	28	26	34	34	28	26
Did not state	5	5	5	1	—	4	9	6	2	4	4	5	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	1	2	6	7

TV more effective than radio and newspapers

for smoking ads	66	82	76	70	72	78	76	37	62	68	65	64	77	54	59	63	76	76	78	70	62	67	65
Yes	33	18	24	29	28	21	23	62	38	31	35	36	21	45	41	37	23	24	20	30	37	32	34
No	1	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	—	1	—	—	2	1	—	—	1	—	2	—	1	1	1
Did not state	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 48. Opinions on What Advertisements Should or Should not Be Banned (Question 62)  
% of individuals who said yes

Items to be banned from advertising	Province*										Community		Education		Age			Sex				
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec			N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
							Eng.	Fr.														
Cigarettes . . . . .	60	70	65	65	67	60	66	60	76	52	69	63	62	61	69	57	58	64	63	61	64	
Liquor . . . . .	55	56	59	65	63	45	48	66	70	45	59	65	54	55	55	51	52	54	59	52	58	
Sleeping Pills . . . . .	66	68	75	82	69	58	64	71	70	64	67	72	66	66	67	59	68	66	69	62	70	
Gasoline . . . . .	11	14	10	7	12	7	14	20	5	10	4	13	11	12	11	11	14	10	13	12	11	
Glue . . . . .	52	50	48	52	50	41	45	71	46	55	45	42	47	54	44	48	44	50	57	49	55	
Pop . . . . .	16	14	12	15	22	12	21	25	8	11	4	18	16	16	15	8	16	14	21	16	16	
Beer . . . . .	39	39	44	57	46	34	37	39	49	39	41	53	37	38	40	30	34	38	43	35	43	
Wine . . . . .	35	36	39	51	46	31	32	33	49	41	35	49	33	34	38	26	28	34	41	33	37	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

*Table 49.* Some reasons why people prefer to read about love:

- "I think reading about violence tends to make a person more violent in nature."
- "Love is inspiring rather than destructive."
- "Love is more constructive. It makes me less bitter."
- "It's more relaxing to read about love."
- "Love is better than fighting. Everywhere you look there's violence. It's nuts."

Those who prefer violence say:

- "Love triangles, etc., get boring."
- "I'm not interested in love. War stories are my favourites."
- "Violence makes a story more exciting."
- "I say violence but I mean adventure."
- "I like action, movement."

Other comments:

- "Sometimes love is violence."
- "Neither is the main theme of life."
- "Neither, really. I like the realistic and humanitarian things."

Some people explain why they get satisfaction in seeing violence:

- "This is the spice of life."
- "Sometimes they deserve it."
- "If the right guy gets it."
- "It's human nature."
- "I'm a sadist."
- "Livens it up more."
- "Exitement makes a show entertaining."
- "I like action. It's stimulating."
- "It's fun. I never take these things seriously."

Those who do not, say:

- "I do not like violence." (About 30% of respondents)
- "Most of it is unnecessary."
- "Uncontrolled emotions are a lack of strength of character."
- "We see enough of it in the world today without watching it on TV."
- "Violence upsets me."
- "It interrupts the hockey game."
- "It influences the young."

Table 49. Preference for Love or Violence; Satisfaction Derived from Violence (Questions 63 and 64)  
% of individuals

Violence v Love-preference	Province*										Population centre			Com- mu- nity	Education	Annual income					Age	Sex													
	Total	B. C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N. B.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female			
<i>Reading preference</i>																																			
Violence . . . . .	18	19	18	22	20	17	17	16	24	27	20	16	19	19	19	18	16	19	18	20	14	17	16	19	26	21	28	24	18	14	28	8			
Love . . . . .	70	65	69	68	67	70	71	75	62	64	69	73	71	68	69	67	70	71	70	68	72	72	72	69	65	69	66	67	72	69	56	84			
Did not state . . . . .	12	16	13	10	13	12	9	14	10	11	10	13	12	14	12	13	11	12	12	12	14	11	12	11	9	10	6	9	10	17	16	8			
<i>Satisfaction from violence</i>																																			
Yes . . . . .	41	45	47	48	44	43	34	31	60	56	67	44	44	45	40	35	45	41	43	35	35	46	43	42	46	37	61	52	41	33	51	31			
No . . . . .	58	54	51	51	55	56	65	68	38	43	31	55	55	53	53	59	64	55	58	56	64	53	56	57	53	62	38	47	58	66	58	68			
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



# SUITABILITY RATING OF MEDIA FOR DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS

Table 50. Opinion on Suitability of Media to Different Age Groups (Question 65)

Audience for media	Percentage of maximum possible score*		
	TV	Radio	Newspaper
	%	%	%
Young people . . . . .	65	73	63
Middle-aged people . . . . .	80	80	85
Older people . . . . .	82	79	83
Business people . . . . .	69	73	90
Working people . . . . .	76	74	81
Housewives . . . . .	77	85	75
Children under 10 . . . . .	55	43	30

\*Respondents rated each medium for suitability to user on a 5 to 1 scale—where 5 represented the highest degree of suitability and 1, the least degree. The maximum suitability score is therefore five times the number of respondents. The rating received is shown as a percentage of the maximum possible score.

## EXCITEMENT AND TV PROGRAMMES

Table 51. Some of the programmes people say have excited them are:

- “Laugh-In”: “It’s entertaining, humorous, and non-violent.”
- Stanley Cup Playoffs
- Moon landing: “I had a feeling of personal involvement,”
- A soap opera: “I didn’t like what the woman was doing, so I told her to stop.”
- A baseball game: “I get excited when the team I want to win gets a home run.”
- Guns of Navarone (movie): “I didn’t know if they would make it and get away.”
- The Money Makers: “I get excited hoping they’ll call me.”
- The Kennedy funeral.
- Psychological dramas
- “Programs with lots of suspense.”

Table 51. Whether or Not TV Programmes Have Excited (Question 66)  
% of individuals

Excited by TV programme	Province*										Population centre				Com- munity		Annual income					Age								
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec			N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
							Eng.	Fr.	Nfld.																					
Yes . . . . .	63	72	70	70	66	64	66	56	57	76	35	58	61	60	62	68	69	54	64	53	57	69	67	60	69	78	73	65	54	
No . . . . .	36	28	30	30	34	35	33	44	40	23	65	42	38	39	38	32	31	46	35	46	42	31	32	40	31	22	26	34	46	
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	3	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

MEDIA OWNERSHIP BY FOREIGNERS

Table 52. Attitudes to Foreign Ownership, in General and in Particular (Questions 67 to 69)  
% of individuals

	Province*					Population centre					Education		Annual income					Age												
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	
Concerned about foreign ownership of Canadian newspapers																														
Yes .....	75	84	80	77	79	81	78	65	65	74	53	71	75	76	72	81	79	73	85	68	69	75	82	79	84	75	70	75	77	
No .....	24	15	20	23	21	19	22	35	35	25	47	29	24	24	27	19	21	27	15	32	31	25	18	21	16	25	29	25	23	
Did not state .....	1	1								1			1																	
Which most acceptable																														
US .....	46	37	43	49	50	50	48	55	65	58	76	50	55	50	57	50	46	49	46	48	50	49	52	45	44	48	51	53	53	
Britain .....	32	47	47	45	43	41	41	3	30	35	18	25	27	36	32	44	42	30	40	33	27	27	37	38	46	34	29	32	35	
France .....	7	1	1	1	1	1	5	34	5			11	10	7	4	1	8	8	5	10	9	9	4	5	4	8	10	7	7	
Other .....	15	15	9	5	6	7	6	8		7	6	14	8	7	7	5	4	13	9	9	14	15	7	12	6	10	10	8	5	
Concerned about foreign ownership of Canadian radio																														
Yes .....	75	84	83	86	77	80	74	65	65	69	47	72	74	77	75	82	78	74	83	70	71	75	84	77	82	72	70	76	78	
No .....	24	16	16	13	23	19	24	35	35	30	53	28	26	23	25	18	22	26	16	30	29	25	16	23	18	28	29	24	22	
Did not state .....	1		1	1		1	2			1									1								1			
Which most acceptable																														
US .....	51	32	53	58	57	53	50	54	70	69	82	56	61	56	59	52	41	54	40	54	55	53	46	51	42	56	53	50	51	
Britain .....	27	42	41	37	37	36	28	9	24	29	12	25	30	32	40	28	25	36	26	29	22	34	35	38	26	26	27	30		
France .....	8	11	2	2		4	5	29		1		11	9	8	6	2	19	8	6	12	9	10	5	7	13	10	12	7	24	
Other .....	14	15	4	3	6	7	6	8	6	1	6	8	5	6	3	6	12	13	18	8	7	15	11	7	7	8	9	16	5	

Table 52. Attitudes to Foreign Ownership, in General and in Particular (Questions 67 to 69) — Continued  
% of individuals

Foreign ownership and preference of owner	Province*										Population centre					Education		Annual income					Age						
	Quebec										Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	
Yes . . . . .	74	81	79	75	76	79	72	66	70	70	47	71	74	74	72	78	78	72	82	69	67	74	80	79	77	70	70	74	77
No . . . . .	25	19	19	23	24	20	27	33	30	30	53	29	25	25	27	21	22	27	17	30	32	25	19	20	23	30	28	26	22
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	2	2	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	2	—	1
<i>Concerned about foreign ownership of Canadian TV</i>																													
US . . . . .	56	40	55	64	58	53	55	55	73	75	86	60	65	52	68	50	45	58	53	56	58	59	52	51	50	62	64	55	59
Britain . . . . .	24	34	36	29	33	32	24	10	22	21	4	22	18	30	20	35	30	21	32	26	28	25	28	35	33	18	20	22	27
France . . . . .	13	12	2	3	1	9	1	27	5	3	4	11	12	12	10	8	14	15	6	12	8	8	14	7	11	12	12	15	9
Other . . . . .	7	14	3	4	8	6	6	8	—	1	6	7	5	6	2	7	11	6	9	6	6	8	6	7	6	8	4	8	5
<i>Which most acceptable</i>																													

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# VIEWS ON MULTIPLE OWNERSHIP

Table 53. Attitudes to Concentration of Media Ownership (Question 70)  
 % of individuals

	Province*					Population centre					Com- muni- ty	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age														
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.			Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
Opinions on concentration of ownership	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>One company allowed to own all local media</i>																																
Agree strongly . . .	15	8	7	18	5	10	14	30	14	8	—	18	23	14	12	8	13	17	14	15	13	17	16	16	15	8	15	15	13	15	14	
Agree somewhat . .	16	11	14	19	13	16	13	21	14	22	27	19	16	18	13	16	16	18	16	17	14	14	23	16	12	19	11	17	19	17	16	
Disagree somewhat .	18	9	18	21	21	14	10	26	19	8	26	20	17	20	15	15	17	21	18	19	14	22	17	16	19	18	15	20	15	19	17	
Disagree strongly . .	50	71	60	42	61	59	62	22	51	62	43	42	43	45	59	60	53	43	51	48	59	45	43	51	54	54	59	48	52	49	52	
Did not state . . . .	1	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	2	—	4	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	2	1	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	1	
<i>One company allowed to own most local newspapers</i>																																
Agree strongly . . .	6	1	3	5	2	4	4	12	3	7	2	8	7	6	4	4	5	9	5	7	3	7	7	8	3	3	4	9	5	5	6	
Agree somewhat . .	13	7	9	19	6	10	8	23	13	10	12	16	15	15	13	7	12	11	13	14	8	14	18	12	11	8	10	13	14	13	13	
Disagree somewhat .	24	14	19	23	17	22	17	38	24	16	41	27	29	29	24	19	21	32	24	25	22	28	26	24	26	21	20	28	24	25	23	
Disagree strongly . .	56	77	68	53	75	63	70	26	57	67	41	48	48	49	58	69	61	47	57	53	66	49	47	55	59	67	66	50	56	56	57	
Did not state . . . .	1	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	3	—	4	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	

Table 53. Attitudes to Concentration of Media Ownership (Question 70) — Continued  
% of individuals

	Province*					Population centre				Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age																	
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.			N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	
Opinions on concentration of ownership	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
One company allowed to own newspapers																																		
in all parts of country																																		
Agree strongly . . .	15	15	17	12	15	16	15	14	16	20	16	16	20	11	16	15	14	17	15	15	15	16	16	15	18	13	10	19	15	15	15	15	15	
Agree somewhat . .	38	38	45	50	40	46	42	19	40	41	39	40	28	37	38	44	36	41	38	37	42	33	38	34	37	46	39	32	31	40	38			
Disagree somewhat .	21	17	15	19	16	15	12	36	19	11	18	21	25	26	21	17	18	22	21	18	26	23	19	21	16	22	26	19	22					
Disagree strongly . .	25	29	22	19	28	22	30	29	22	27	21	23	26	23	24	24	31	18	26	26	24	23	28	29	22	26	31	27	25	24				
Did not state . . . .	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	6	—	1	3	1	—	1	2	—	1	—	2	1	1	2	1	—	—	1	1	1	1	
One company allowed to own TV stations																																		
in all parts of country																																		
Agree strongly . . .	14	13	17	14	14	14	15	12	13	20	19	16	18	10	15	14	13	16	14	14	14	16	15	16	13	9	15	14	16	14	14			
Agree somewhat . .	31	33	38	39	34	36	34	20	30	29	35	29	22	31	35	37	32	32	32	30	37	23	31	32	30	38	33	25	27	35	30			
Disagree somewhat .	23	21	14	19	20	20	10	36	30	11	22	26	28	30	19	17	19	26	23	24	19	30	23	19	23	24	20	24	28	21	23			
Disagree strongly . .	31	32	30	28	32	29	39	31	24	39	20	29	32	26	30	31	35	26	31	31	29	29	29	30	32	33	29	32	37	27	29	32		
Did not state . . . .	1	1	1	—	—	1	2	1	3	1	4	1	—	3	1	1	1	—	—	1	1	2	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	



*One company allowed to own radio stations in all parts of country*

Agree strongly . . .	14	13	18	11	15	15	14	12	14	19	14	13	18	9	16	15	14	14	14	15	14	16	14	10	14	14	15	13	15		
Agree somewhat . .	32	35	37	40	34	36	38	19	35	33	35	32	22	31	35	36	33	34	32	31	37	31	29	32	38	35	26	28	36	30	
Disagree somewhat .	22	19	15	23	16	19	8	36	24	8	27	25	26	29	21	17	18	24	23	23	19	27	24	21	19	24	20	27	28	21	21
Disagree strongly . .	31	32	29	26	34	29	39	31	24	40	20	29	33	28	27	31	34	27	31	31	18	29	29	33	34	27	31	33	28	29	33
Did not state . . . .	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	2	3	—	4	1	1	3	1	1	1	—	1	1	2	2	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	1

*No absentee owners of broadcast stations*

Agree strongly . . .	33	32	21	29	33	28	32	46	38	36	10	36	38	26	29	28	36	32	33	34	29	37	35	38	29	24	29	32	24	34	37
Agree somewhat . .	31	30	37	30	31	34	26	25	30	39	31	28	31	33	33	30	33	31	31	31	31	32	28	31	29	30	29	34	32	31	
Disagree somewhat .	21	27	24	31	24	22	20	15	19	24	33	19	17	25	21	27	19	21	22	20	27	18	18	20	23	30	26	23	26	19	18
Disagree strongly . .	13	9	15	10	10	14	19	12	8	11	8	12	16	14	15	10	13	13	13	13	11	12	13	12	16	14	14	14	13	11	
Did not state . . . .	2	2	3	—	2	2	3	2	5	—	10	2	1	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	3

*One company allowed to control more than one medium in one area*

Agree strongly . . .	19	10	12	19	22	16	15	29	8	18	10	22	21	16	16	16	18	20	18	19	16	22	21	20	15	13	18	21	23	17	19
Agree somewhat . .	27	25	31	30	23	26	30	28	22	23	37	30	25	26	21	29	26	26	27	27	26	20	27	29	29	31	24	28	21	29	26
Disagree somewhat .	25	19	19	26	30	27	19	24	27	24	33	25	27	28	25	22	23	29	24	25	24	29	27	21	23	26	25	24	23	25	25
Disagree strongly . .	28	45	37	24	24	30	34	17	40	35	12	22	26	26	37	33	31	24	29	27	32	27	24	29	32	29	32	27	31	28	28
Did not state . . . .	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	—	8	1	1	4	1	—	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	—	2	1	2

*No company allowed controlling interest of companies in more than one medium*

Agree strongly . . .	32	34	31	17	35	27	25	44	35	23	8	33	32	28	35	30	32	31	32	31	33	36	31	34	30	29	31	27	27	32	34
Agree somewhat . .	27	25	28	28	22	27	24	27	21	31	37	30	25	29	21	26	27	29	27	28	24	22	26	29	30	29	23	30	27	28	24
Disagree somewhat .	23	19	24	34	29	28	20	16	19	22	39	22	24	25	23	27	21	26	23	28	21	25	20	23	25	28	25	25	24	22	
Disagree strongly . .	17	22	16	21	13	17	28	12	22	24	8	14	19	14	21	16	19	14	17	17	15	19	16	15	16	16	18	17	19	15	18
Did not state . . . .	1	—	1	—	1	1	3	1	3	—	8	1	—	4	—	1	1	—	1	2	—	2	2	2	1	1	—	1	2	1	2

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# NEWS REPORTING

Table 54. Preferences for Various Types of News Reporting (Question 71)

% of individuals

	Province*										Population centre							Com- munity cation		Annual income					Age			Sex						
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female		
Media reporting preferred																																		
<i>Simple and factual</i>																																		
Agree strongly . . . . .	87	85	82	89	79	86	91	90	89	92	74	89	86	87	87	85	86	89	87	89	81	90	88	89	84	82	83	76	78	87	91	87	87	
Agree somewhat . . . . .	11	12	15	10	18	12	6	7	6	6	26	10	11	11	10	11	11	9	11	10	14	8	10	9	13	15	13	20	14	11	8	11	11	
Disagree . . . . .	2	2	1	3	2	2	3	5	2	—	1	3	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	2	2	3	3	4	7	2	1	2	2		
Did not state . . . . .	—	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—		
<i>Least possible effort</i>																																		
Agree strongly . . . . .	66	61	62	58	71	66	61	66	86	78	49	65	69	66	68	64	64	69	65	69	53	78	66	66	61	57	60	57	60	63	73	67	65	
Agree somewhat . . . . .	24	29	29	31	24	25	21	21	11	17	43	25	20	24	26	26	25	24	25	23	31	16	25	25	25	30	28	28	26	27	20	23	26	
Disagree . . . . .	9	8	8	10	5	8	18	13	—	5	8	10	11	10	6	9	11	6	10	8	16	5	8	8	13	13	12	15	13	10	6	10	9	
Did not state . . . . .	1	2	1	1	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—		
<i>Easy to understand</i>																																		
Agree strongly . . . . .	83	79	79	82	92	81	75	88	89	90	78	85	90	85	87	77	79	88	83	87	70	90	87	87	80	71	72	77	79	84	86	80	87	
Agree somewhat . . . . .	13	18	17	6	14	13	9	11	10	20	12	7	12	10	18	17	10	13	11	21	7	11	11	15	20	20	18	17	12	11	15	10		
Disagree . . . . .	3	2	2	1	2	4	12	1	—	—	2	1	3	3	2	4	4	1	3	2	8	1	1	1	5	8	7	5	3	3	2	4	2	
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	2	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	2	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	2	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—		

# *Stories that are happy*

Agree strongly . . . . .	62	47	52	56	60	54	66	81	68	67	57	68	63	62	64	53	61	66	61	65	49	74	69	66	56	50	47	49	52	62	67	56	68
Agree somewhat . . . . .	30	46	42	39	34	35	24	14	27	29	29	26	29	26	30	40	30	29	31	29	37	22	25	27	34	40	40	34	30	27	34	27	
Disagree . . . . .	7	5	4	5	6	10	5	5	4	10	5	7	11	5	6	9	5	8	6	13	3	5	6	9	10	12	11	12	7	5	9	5	
Did not state . . . . .	1	2	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	—	2	1	1	—	

# Gory details

Agree strongly . . . . .	15	13	11	18	7	12	23	20	11	22	20	15	14	15	22	13	15	13	15	17	8	16	20	16	13	14	9	25	16	14	13	19	11
Agree somewhat . . . . .	27	27	35	30	29	28	17	20	40	37	31	29	33	23	29	28	21	29	27	27	25	23	25	27	30	31	26	31	28	29	23	29	24
Disagree . . . . .	57	58	53	52	64	60	60	60	49	41	47	56	53	61	48	58	64	58	58	55	66	61	55	56	55	64	44	55	57	64	51	65	
Did not state . . . . .	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# CANADIAN NEWS REPORTING – OPTIMISTIC OR PESSIMISTIC?

Table 55. Opinion on Outlook of News Media – Optimistic or Pessimistic? (Question 72)  
% of individuals

News media are	Province*											Population centre							Edu- cation
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	High school or less	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	Eng.	Fr.	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	College
Pessimistic . . . . .	23	23	19	19	22	21	29	28	16	20	6	18	21	19	22	27	27	21	29
Optimistic . . . . .	21	20	23	31	26	24	20	15	16	23	29	22	21	22	25	20	19	22	19
Neither . . . . .	54	54	52	50	50	54	48	56	65	52	65	58	57	55	51	51	53	55	51
Did not state . . . . .	2	3	6	—	2	1	3	1	3	5	—	2	1	4	2	2	1	2	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 56. Opinion of Particular Media as sources of Information on Specific Topics (Question 73)  
% of individuals

	Province*				Population centre				Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income				Age				Sex																
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.			N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M		Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
Adequacy of media in certain areas; preference of medium																																			
Enough information about																																			
Consumer Goods																																			
Yes	66	61	68	60	71	65	69	68	73	57	65	69	62	70	68	60	67	69	65	68	58	64	67	68	62	62	70	72	63	66	66	65			
No	31	37	28	40	26	31	28	30	16	41	16	26	33	27	29	37	31	27	31	29	39	32	29	28	30	36	36	30	27	34	29	31	31		
Did not state	3	2	4	—	3	4	3	2	11	2	19	5	5	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	2	—	1	3	5	3	4			
— Which medium best																																			
TV	37	29	38	37	33	29	32	53	35	43	31	40	39	37	41	32	37	34	37	39	27	44	42	40	34	29	26	50	52	37	30	36	38		
Radio	11	10	16	4	15	9	10	10	8	17	18	13	10	12	8	10	15	10	11	12	13	9	12	9	7	7	10	11	11	9	13				
Newspapers	48	58	39	54	52	58	51	35	49	36	43	44	47	48	46	56	49	47	49	47	56	40	43	48	50	58	61	38	35	48	55	51	46		
Did not state	4	3	7	5	—	4	7	2	8	4	8	3	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	6	4	2	3	4	4	6	5	3	4	4	4	3		
Changes in Law																																			
Yes	52	40	49	46	59	49	58	57	46	51	59	53	52	51	57	47	51	48	52	53	48	52	54	50	53	51	50	56	55	52	51	48	55		
No	45	57	48	54	37	46	38	42	38	47	25	43	44	45	40	51	46	49	45	44	49	44	42	47	44	46	48	49	44	45	44	49	41		
Did not state	3	3	3	—	4	5	4	1	16	2	16	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	1	1	3	5	3	4		
— Which medium best																																			
TV	23	15	17	22	16	16	11	40	14	21	53	27	25	29	17	17	22	23	25	14	30	31	26	18	18	10	27	29	23	19	22	23			
Radio	9	11	11	8	7	8	10	5	20	6	12	5	9	5	7	13	13	9	9	10	12	9	8	9	7	6	13	7	9	8	10				
Newspapers	62	65	65	56	75	72	73	46	62	54	33	57	64	58	61	69	65	61	63	60	71	52	55	60	70	72	77	54	56	63	66	64	61		
Did not state	6	9	7	11	1	5	8	4	19	5	8	4	6	8	5	7	5	4	5	6	5	6	5	6	3	3	7	6	8	5	7	6	6		

Table 56. Opinion of Particular Media as sources of Information on Specific Topics (Question 73) — *Continued*  
 % of individuals

	Province*					Population centre					Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age			Sex														
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.			Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban		High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
Adequacy of media in certain areas; preference of medium																																			
Consumer Places to Shop																																			
Yes	82	82	90	74	87	84	88	78	81	74	72	84	73	83	85	83	84	85	82	82	81	80	83	81	83	86	81	82	82	80	84	81	83		
No	15	16	7	26	10	12	9	21	5	24	12	13	22	13	12	15	13	12	15	15	16	16	14	16	15	11	17	17	17	17	11	16	14		
Did not state	3	2	3	—	3	4	3	1	14	2	16	3	5	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	3	5	3	3		
— Which medium best																																			
TV	21	12	23	20	11	18	38	11	28	29	25	22	21	20	19	18	20	21	23	14	23	30	24	17	13	10	29	30	21	17	22	20			
Radio	13	14	18	9	12	10	13	23	20	17	13	11	11	12	11	18	12	13	10	18	13	12	13	11	9	20	14	11	13	12	13				
Newspapers	63	71	58	50	70	74	64	49	73	47	45	55	61	64	65	66	68	57	64	61	73	55	55	61	68	73	77	47	51	66	66	63	63		
Did not state	3	3	5	9	1	3	6	3	3	2	6	3	4	4	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	3	4	4	5	2	4	3	4		
Taxes																																			
Yes	60	56	63	48	58	58	65	64	49	63	67	62	60	64	58	57	58	63	60	61	56	57	62	58	61	64	57	55	56	60	62	58	62		
No	37	42	34	51	39	38	29	35	35	17	35	35	32	38	41	39	34	37	35	41	38	34	38	36	33	41	43	42	37	33	39	34			
Did not state	3	2	3	1	3	4	6	1	16	2	16	3	5	4	2	3	3	3	4	3	5	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	3	5	3	4			
— Which medium best																																			
TV	21	11	12	19	10	13	13	40	13	23	37	25	25	22	23	15	16	23	21	22	14	30	27	21	14	17	11	29	26	20	17	21	20		
Radio	7	8	10	7	9	6	5	6	8	16	12	10	4	6	4	4	10	11	7	8	5	9	9	6	6	6	3	8	7	7	6	8			
Newspapers	67	71	59	81	77	74	51	60	60	43	61	66	66	67	75	68	62	68	65	76	54	60	68	76	73	80	57	59	68	71	67	67			
Did not state	5	10	7	15	—	4	8	3	19	1	8	4	5	6	6	6	4	4	5	5	7	4	5	4	4	6	6	7	5	5	6	5			
Canadian Economics																																			
Yes	56	45	56	53	54	58	71	57	38	52	55	58	55	57	58	52	57	59	56	58	49	58	53	56	58	56	58	47	53	57	58	55	58		
No	40	52	40	46	43	36	23	41	46	45	20	38	40	37	37	45	40	36	40	37	47	36	41	40	39	42	39	52	45	39	35	42	37		
Did not state	4	3	4	1	3	6	6	2	16	3	25	4	5	6	5	3	5	4	5	4	6	6	4	3	2	3	1	2	4	7	3	5			



- Which medium best	23 17 23 27 16 16 11 40 16 20 35 29 30 22 30 15 17 21 24 25 16 30 29 25 19 16 14 30 28 23 20 23 24
TV .....	
Radio .....	8 5 7 7 6 6 10 14 16 10 10 6 11 4 5 7 15 6 8 6 12 7 8 5 7 3 6 8 7 7 8
Newspapers .....	63 68 62 59 78 72 75 47 51 57 33 56 60 58 58 72 71 60 63 61 71 51 57 61 72 73 76 57 55 63 67 65 61
Did not state .....	6 10 8 7 - 6 8 3 19 7 22 5 4 9 8 8 5 4 7 6 7 7 7 6 4 4 7 7 9 6 6 5 7
<i>Canadian Labour</i>	
Yes .....	62 59 64 52 59 65 71 60 54 63 67 61 61 62 67 59 66 63 63 64 59 62 64 62 65 59 63 57 62 64 63 60 65
No .....	34 37 31 48 37 30 23 39 30 35 14 35 34 33 28 37 31 32 33 32 38 33 32 34 31 38 34 42 36 32 31 37 30
Did not state .....	4 4 5 - 4 5 6 1 16 2 19 4 5 5 4 3 5 4 4 3 5 4 4 4 3 3 1 2 4 6 3 4
- Which medium best	
TV .....	23 20 22 26 15 18 12 30 24 30 47 27 24 22 27 19 18 20 23 24 18 29 26 26 20 17 12 28 26 23 20 21 24
Radio .....	9 8 13 5 11 6 10 14 - 11 10 13 10 10 6 6 9 15 9 10 8 12 12 8 9 6 7 10 9 9 10 9 10
Newspapers .....	62 65 57 56 73 70 70 52 60 57 31 55 61 61 60 67 68 59 62 60 67 52 58 60 65 72 74 55 57 63 64 64 60
Did not state .....	6 7 8 13 1 6 8 4 16 2 12 5 5 7 7 8 5 6 6 7 7 4 6 6 5 7 7 8 5 6 6 6
<i>Canadian Politics</i>	
Yes .....	74 64 77 78 76 74 82 74 73 71 78 75 73 77 79 69 74 75 74 72 72 73 75 75 74 69 72 75 75 73 75
No .....	22 32 20 22 21 21 13 25 11 27 6 21 22 19 17 28 23 20 23 22 24 23 22 23 23 23 30 27 22 20 24 21
Did not state .....	4 4 3 - 3 5 5 1 16 2 16 4 5 4 4 3 3 5 3 4 4 5 4 3 2 3 1 1 3 5 3 4
- Which medium best	
TV .....	38 35 36 52 33 30 26 48 60 41 61 44 43 39 45 27 32 38 38 40 31 43 47 41 29 34 27 41 47 39 33 37 39
Radio .....	7 8 7 7 11 6 8 7 - 12 10 9 6 8 5 6 8 9 7 7 6 9 9 6 8 5 4 4 7 8 7 5 9
Newspapers .....	51 52 51 36 56 60 60 43 35 45 21 44 48 48 46 61 57 48 51 50 58 44 42 50 59 58 65 52 42 50 55 54 49
Did not state .....	4 5 6 5 - 4 6 2 5 2 8 3 3 5 4 6 3 5 4 3 5 4 2 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 5 4 3
<i>National Unity</i>	
Yes .....	62 49 63 60 70 63 65 63 57 67 63 65 62 61 65 58 62 61 62 63 59 63 62 62 63 65 59 48 68 64 62 60 65
No .....	33 47 34 40 26 31 28 36 27 29 14 31 34 34 30 37 34 34 33 32 37 32 34 33 33 32 37 50 31 31 32 36 30
Did not state .....	5 4 3 - 4 6 7 1 16 4 23 4 4 5 5 4 5 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 4 3 4 2 1 5 6 4 5
- Which medium best	
TV .....	35 34 36 41 36 32 23 40 30 41 55 42 39 39 39 28 30 35 36 37 29 39 41 36 31 33 27 42 39 37 31 33 38
Radio .....	7 8 10 5 7 5 8 5 16 4 8 6 7 3 6 8 10 7 7 7 10 7 6 7 5 8 6 7 7 7 7 7
Newspapers .....	51 50 47 44 54 55 61 48 46 41 29 45 50 44 48 58 56 49 51 49 56 44 45 52 56 56 61 41 49 50 55 53 49
Did not state .....	7 8 7 10 3 8 8 4 19 2 12 5 5 10 10 8 6 6 6 7 8 7 7 6 6 6 7 9 6 6 7 7 6

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# INFLUENCE OF MEDIA ON ATTITUDES

Table 57. Opinion of Influence of Media on Attitudes to Specific Subjects (Question 74)  
% of individuals

	Provinces*					Population centre					Com- mu- nity	Edu- ca- tion	Annual income					Age			Sex															
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	Nfld.	Under 5M			5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less		College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female		
Money																																				
TV	43	36	52	55	34	32	35	56	59	43	49	46	46	49	44	36	38	41	43	45	35	44	48	49	42	33	31	64	63	44	30	42	43			
Radio	5	5	3	6	5	3	5	3	12	4	7	4	4	3	4	6	7	5	5	4	8	7	4	4	2	5	4	2	5	4	4	7	5	5		
Newspapers	46	53	40	32	58	56	47	35	38	39	43	43	44	41	48	53	49	47	46	45	52	42	41	42	48	58	59	28	30	47	55	48	45			
Did not state	6	6	5	7	2	7	15	4	-	6	4	4	6	6	5	7	7	5	6	5	9	6	4	5	6	5	8	3	3	5	8	5	7			
Travel																																				
TV	64	76	74	79	68	61	42	59	65	71	90	69	61	65	63	69	57	68	64	64	63	62	67	66	65	63	57	79	74	65	56	64	64			
Radio	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	3	7	2	4	5	3	3	2	4	6	3	4	2	5	3	3	3	3	3	2	5	4	4	4	4	4			
Newspapers	29	19	20	15	27	32	43	34	32	22	4	25	33	26	31	25	35	24	29	29	30	28	26	28	29	32	36	18	19	28	35	30	29			
Did not state	3	3	2	3	2	4	12	3	-	4	2	1	6	3	4	4	2	4	3	5	5	2	3	3	2	4	1	2	3	5	2	3	2			
Security																																				
TV	37	29	31	34	26	32	65	30	30	45	39	41	41	44	28	37	35	38	39	31	42	45	41	33	30	26	53	52	39	28	37	38				
Radio	9	10	9	7	12	8	7	9	3	22	14	12	7	9	4	8	10	13	9	8	13	10	7	7	6	8	12	7	8	9	8	10				
Newspapers	47	53	55	60	57	45	24	62	43	35	46	47	43	46	56	45	49	47	46	52	39	40	46	54	58	58	33	36	47	54	50	45				
Did not state	7	8	5	4	2	9	16	2	5	6	3	5	7	6	8	8	3	6	6	9	6	5	6	6	6	8	2	5	6	9	5	7				

<i>Law</i>		
TV	26 25 19 28 16 21 19 39 27 23 51 29 27 28 32 22 23 22 27 28 18 31 32 29 24 19 17 37 35 27 20 24 28	
Radio	6 8 9 5 4 6 3 6 3 16 2 9 5 6 3 5 7 10 6 6 7 8 5 5 4 5 9 9 6 6 6 7	
Newspapers	65 63 71 63 80 69 72 54 62 56 43 60 63 70 66 66 64 63 71 57 57 64 67 75 76 53 54 64 70 67 62	
Did not state	3 4 1 4 - 4 6 1 8 5 4 2 3 6 2 3 4 2 3 3 4 4 3 2 4 2 2 1 2 3 4 3 3	
<i>Courts</i>		
TV	20 25 18 22 17 16 11 24 30 18 27 21 21 21 19 17 17 20 22 12 22 24 21 16 17 13 35 29 17 16 19 20	
Radio	5 6 6 8 3 4 6 5 5 12 10 6 3 5 3 4 7 9 5 5 5 7 6 4 4 3 5 8 5 5 5 6	
Newspapers	72 65 74 68 80 76 75 69 57 65 55 72 73 67 74 74 72 72 70 78 66 67 72 77 77 80 56 64 75 74 73 71	
Did not state	3 4 2 2 - 4 8 2 8 5 8 1 3 7 2 3 4 2 3 3 5 5 3 3 3 3 2 1 2 3 5 3 3	
<i>Economic System</i>		
TV	23 21 19 27 13 18 13 36 30 21 33 29 25 20 29 17 19 22 23 25 15 29 29 25 15 21 15 29 30 24 19 21 26	
Radio	7 6 11 7 6 3 7 3 14 12 9 6 7 5 7 6 12 6 8 5 10 9 6 8 3 3 6 9 7 7 7 7	
Newspapers	66 69 65 64 80 71 77 56 59 61 43 60 67 65 63 73 71 65 67 64 76 59 59 65 75 73 79 62 58 66 69 68 64	
Did not state	4 4 5 2 1 4 7 1 8 4 12 2 2 8 3 3 4 1 4 3 4 7 3 4 2 3 3 3 3 3 5 4 3	
<i>School system</i>		
TV	25 11 17 28 16 16 24 48 27 22 22 33 28 23 24 18 23 25 25 27 17 33 33 26 20 20 12 33 30 26 20 24 26	
Radio	9 9 11 13 10 7 7 9 8 14 25 12 7 9 8 8 8 17 8 9 8 12 10 9 10 7 6 11 9 9 8 8 10	
Newspapers	63 76 68 58 72 74 61 41 65 64 43 53 63 63 65 71 66 56 64 61 70 51 55 63 67 71 80 53 58 63 67 64 63	
Did not state	3 4 4 1 2 3 8 2 - - 10 2 2 5 3 3 2 3 3 2 3 3 5 4 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 5 4 1	
<i>Religion</i>		
TV	33 32 23 35 22 30 24 42 46 36 49 34 35 30 46 28 31 31 34 34 29 32 37 35 29 33 32 42 33 28 31 36	
Radio	18 26 31 30 31 14 8 15 11 33 18 29 16 20 11 16 15 26 18 20 14 24 19 15 11 13 21 18 18 18 48 19	
Newspapers	38 29 33 30 45 42 41 39 35 18 27 32 40 35 43 40 38 37 37 40 34 33 43 45 42 29 32 37 42 40 35	
Did not state	11 13 13 5 2 14 27 4 8 13 6 5 9 15 8 13 14 5 11 9 17 10 6 9 13 11 13 8 5 12 12 11 10	
<i>Sex</i>		
TV	69 69 78 86 79 69 53 61 95 76 84 78 67 64 77 74 62 74 70 71 66 71 69 69 72 70 69 75 76 70 65 67 72	
Radio	3 5 3 - 4 2 3 3 - 5 4 2 1 2 1 4 3 3 2 4 3 2 3 2 2 1 3 2 3 2	
Newspapers	20 16 12 9 17 19 21 33 5 7 8 16 24 21 17 16 24 19 20 20 19 19 23 21 17 21 19 17 20 19 23 22 18	
Did not state	8 10 7 5 - 10 23 3 - 12 4 4 8 13 5 6 10 4 7 6 13 6 5 7 9 6 10 6 3 8 10 8 8	

Table 57. Opinion of Influence of Media on Attitudes to Specific Subjects (Question 74) — *Continued*  
 % of individuals

	Province*	Population centre					Com- mu- nity	Edu- ca- tion	Annual income					Age			Sex																			
		B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.			Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20 M50-M		50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
Love																																				
TV		74	75	79	81	76	74	59	70	97	70	86	78	76	70	78	75	69	80	74	76	66	75	76	74	76	72	72	78	82	76	69	71	77		
Radio		3	4	2	4	3	1	4	—	7	2	3	2	4	2	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	2	4	2	5	2	3	3	3	3		
Newspapers		15	10	10	11	19	13	18	22	3	10	8	14	13	14	14	16	12	14	14	17	13	16	15	13	17	15	13	12	13	17	17	12			
Did not state		8	11	9	6	1	10	22	4	—	13	4	5	9	12	6	8	10	5	9	7	14	7	5	8	9	7	11	4	4	8	11	9	8		
Marriage																																				
TV		60	63	65	78	58	61	44	55	76	60	59	65	54	57	68	59	57	67	60	61	55	61	65	59	59	61	54	67	73	61	53	56	63		
Radio		4	4	6	2	4	2	4	6	—	9	4	5	3	4	2	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	3	5	4	5	4		
Newspapers		27	23	20	14	37	26	31	35	16	19	31	25	35	27	23	27	29	24	28	28	28	27	26	29	28	28	31	27	19	27	31	31	24		
Did not state		9	10	9	6	1	11	21	4	8	12	6	5	8	12	7	9	9	4	8	7	14	7	5	8	9	7	12	3	3	8	11	8	9		
Family																																				
TV		61	69	65	72	61	57	55	60	81	59	66	62	59	60	70	60	59	60	62	61	59	57	66	62	60	60	60	70	73	65	51	58	64		
Radio		6	5	7	8	4	5	4	8	—	14	14	9	6	5	2	6	7	10	6	7	4	10	7	5	5	5	3	4	6	6	7	6	7		
Newspapers		25	18	19	17	34	29	23	29	14	17	12	24	27	25	22	27	26	26	25	26	25	27	23	25	27	29	27	23	17	22	32	29	21		
Did not state		8	8	9	3	1	9	18	3	5	10	8	5	8	10	6	7	8	4	7	6	12	6	4	8	8	6	10	3	4	7	10	7	8		
Birth Control																																				
TV		31	28	36	48	36	29	14	30	43	42	47	37	36	32	35	28	24	34	31	32	27	34	40	30	29	27	24	30	41	32	28	32	30		
Radio		6	6	8	2	9	3	2	9	8	10	6	9	4	5	3	4	7	10	5	6	4	8	6	4	2	4	7	5	5	6	6	6			

Newspapers	54 57 45 44 52 58 65 57 43 30 39 49 51 49 55 59 59 52 54 53 59 48 46 55 58 63 63 58 49 54 55 54 55
Did not state	9 9 11 6 3 10 19 4 6 18 8 5 9 14 7 9 10 4 10 9 10 10 6 9 9 8 9 5 5 9 11 8 9
<i>Divorce</i>	
TV	37 42 36 55 41 34 23 36 35 42 45 44 34 37 37 37 31 42 37 38 33 40 43 34 36 35 31 44 42 39 30 36 37
Radio	4 4 8 10 5 2 1 6 5 8 4 5 4 6 3 4 5 7 4 5 3 7 5 4 2 2 5 4 2 5 4 6 4 5
Newspapers	51 43 46 29 53 54 58 54 49 35 47 46 54 47 53 50 55 47 51 50 51 45 47 54 51 53 57 47 51 48 55 52 50
Did not state	8 11 10 6 1 10 18 4 11 15 4 5 8 10 7 9 9 4 8 7 13 8 5 7 9 10 10 4 3 9 9 8 8
<i>Canadian Nationalism</i>	
TV	36 34 40 49 35 30 33 40 38 41 53 40 40 36 40 31 32 43 35 36 38 40 38 37 35 35 31 39 37 39 31 36 36
Radio	7 6 10 4 6 6 5 8 8 17 12 8 5 8 5 9 7 8 7 7 6 9 8 6 4 4 10 6 7 6 9
Newspapers	53 54 47 46 58 59 52 49 49 37 29 49 53 48 51 56 56 47 54 53 45 50 52 55 57 62 49 55 50 57 54 51
Did not state	4 6 3 1 1 5 10 3 5 5 6 3 2 8 4 4 5 2 4 4 3 6 4 3 4 4 3 2 2 4 6 4 4
<i>Political Fever</i>	
TV	51 52 57 75 50 48 40 49 62 52 65 58 52 48 53 52 44 57 51 50 56 51 52 53 49 53 48 49 50 55 47 51 52
Radio	7 6 6 6 9 6 6 7 16 10 14 9 7 8 2 7 6 9 7 7 5 8 9 5 6 4 6 8 5 7 6 6 7
Newspapers	39 37 35 17 41 42 45 42 22 35 19 32 39 38 42 38 45 33 39 40 36 34 37 39 42 40 43 40 42 35 42 40 38
Did not state	3 5 2 2 - 4 9 2 - 3 2 1 2 6 3 3 5 1 3 3 3 7 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
<i>Clothes Fads</i>	
TV	57 61 66 73 60 50 30 61 51 70 76 69 60 60 58 53 45 64 57 58 52 55 61 64 54 57 45 56 66 60 52 56 59
Radio	2 1 2 - 2 2 2 6 2 2 1 1 2 3 1 3 3 2 2 1 3 1 2 2 1 1 3 2 2 1 2 2
Newspapers	37 34 30 25 38 43 54 34 43 23 18 28 36 31 35 41 48 31 37 36 41 36 35 31 40 39 50 38 29 35 41 38 37
Did not state	4 4 2 2 - 5 14 3 - 5 4 2 3 7 4 5 4 2 4 4 6 6 3 3 4 3 4 3 3 3 6 4 2
<i>Clothes Styles</i>	
TV	57 64 66 69 50 52 31 61 57 77 78 69 59 62 54 53 48 69 56 60 50 56 63 63 57 56 42 56 67 60 53 56 59
Radio	1 2 2 1 1 - - 1 - 2 - 1 1 - - 2 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 - - 2 1 1 1 1
Newspapers	38 31 31 28 49 44 53 36 43 18 18 28 38 33 43 42 46 28 39 36 43 38 33 34 38 41 54 39 28 36 42 38 38
Did not state	4 3 1 2 - 4 16 2 - 3 4 2 2 5 3 5 4 1 4 3 6 4 3 2 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 5 2
<i>Student Movement</i>	
TV	57 58 59 76 60 54 40 56 54 62 82 67 59 61 59 54 46 64 56 59 49 57 63 60 57 53 47 54 61 59 55 57 57
Radio	5 4 7 2 5 4 5 6 - 6 6 6 5 4 4 4 5 7 5 4 7 7 4 3 3 4 8 7 4 4 5 5
Newspapers	35 35 33 19 35 38 46 36 43 30 8 25 34 31 34 39 46 27 36 33 43 31 28 34 37 41 47 37 30 35 36 35 35
Did not state	3 3 1 3 - 4 9 2 3 2 4 2 2 4 3 3 3 2 3 3 4 5 2 2 3 3 2 1 2 2 5 3 3



Table 57. Opinion of Influence of Media on Attitudes to Specific Subjects (Question 74) — *Continued*  
% of individuals

	Province*					Population centre					Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age	Sex														
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	Quebec	Under 5M	5M-20M			20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural			Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000					
Medium most influential on attitudes to																																	
<i>Personal Habits</i>																																	
TV	55	61	58	70	46	54	36	56	62	47	53	61	53	54	65	52	49	60	55	56	52	56	59	56	53	48	58	70	58	47	54	56	
Radio	8	3	12	6	12	6	7	9	11	19	23	10	10	7	5	8	6	11	8	9	4	11	10	7	7	5	6	14	6	7	8	9	
Newspapers	28	24	21	20	42	28	38	31	19	17	14	24	29	7	23	30	33	26	28	27	30	25	28	29	33	33	24	20	26	33	30	26	
Did not state	9	12	9	4	—	12	19	4	8	17	10	5	8	12	7	10	12	3	9	8	14	8	6	9	8	9	13	4	9	12	8	9	
<i>Strikes</i>																																	
TV	43	27	46	59	53	34	37	54	48	43	53	50	49	41	41	40	35	49	42	44	37	50	47	42	37	38	35	43	48	43	41	44	41
Radio	9	13	5	11	7	8	4	10	3	16	18	12	10	5	8	7	10	13	9	9	9	11	12	11	8	6	7	9	10	8	10	8	11
Newspapers	45	56	48	28	40	55	52	33	46	39	27	36	39	49	48	51	51	36	46	44	51	36	39	45	52	53	56	47	40	46	45	46	
Did not state	3	4	1	2	—	3	7	3	3	2	2	2	2	5	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	
<i>Profanity</i>																																	
TV	59	65	74	88	71	62	24	41	76	70	74	66	58	61	59	66	46	71	58	60	56	62	59	60	60	58	56	58	59	60	58	57	60
Radio	5	4	7	1	5	5	4	6	—	11	12	6	4	5	4	7	7	5	4	6	4	5	4	6	4	5	4	8	6	5	4	5	6
Newspapers	25	20	9	7	22	18	47	47	16	7	8	22	28	24	25	18	33	17	25	25	25	24	26	24	24	26	27	29	26	24	25	28	23
Did not state	11	11	10	4	2	15	25	6	8	12	6	6	10	11	11	12	14	5	12	10	15	8	9	12	11	12	13	5	9	11	13	10	11

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



Table 58. Opinion on Function of Media (Question 75)  
% of individuals

	Province*							Population centre							Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income							Age	Sex								
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural			Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000			10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female	
Medium which																																	
<i>Is most personal</i>																																	
TV	31	31	38	30	26	30	28	31	43	33	41	31	33	27	36	33	29	28	32	33	26	38	33	34	30	31	20	34	32	29	29	33	
Radio	19	21	23	17	20	17	25	20	22	25	14	18	17	23	16	21	21	18	20	19	20	19	19	19	21	15	20	23	19	18	16	23	
Newspapers	47	46	37	49	54	49	45	48	35	36	43	49	49	45	42	46	52	46	50	41	47	45	46	51	55	41	47	50	53	41			
Did not state	3	2	2	4	4	2	1	—	6	2	2	1	1	3	4	2	4	2	2	2	4	2	1	2	3	5	2	2	3	2	3		
<i>Is most relaxing</i>																																	
TV	61	64	63	64	49	53	60	75	81	47	78	63	60	60	61	61	64	59	62	62	60	64	64	61	59	64	55	65	64	56	61	62	
Radio	25	26	25	25	33	29	28	15	8	35	18	23	22	25	22	27	25	22	25	23	29	21	22	25	26	22	30	27	24	24	23	26	
Newspapers	13	10	12	11	18	17	10	10	11	17	4	14	18	15	16	11	10	19	13	14	11	15	13	13	15	13	14	7	12	19	15	12	
Did not state	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	1	1	1	—	1	—		
<i>Lets you forget</i>																																	
TV	62	66	58	62	50	58	56	73	62	62	69	63	59	64	66	62	64	62	63	62	62	65	62	63	61	64	57	59	66	60	61	64	
Radio	27	26	35	31	38	30	32	16	24	29	27	27	28	20	30	26	27	27	27	29	23	26	26	30	28	33	34	26	25	27	27		
Newspapers	9	6	5	6	12	9	9	10	14	7	2	9	12	7	11	6	8	10	9	9	7	11	11	9	7	6	8	6	7	13	10	7	
Did not state	2	2	2	1	—	3	3	1	—	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	

Table 58. Opinion on Function of Media (Question 75) — Continued  
% of individuals

Medium which is	Province*		Population centre										Com- mu- nity		Edu- cation		Annual income					Age		Sex												
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 25	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female				
<i>Makes you think</i>																																				
TV	35	31	35	34	29	34	18	40	46	34	47	39	34	33	42	35	27	40	35	38	24	40	42	38	31	29	20	38	33	35	32	38				
Radio	11	11	13	6	13	9	11	13	5	18	14	11	10	15	6	10	10	11	11	11	10	13	12	9	12	11	8	11	11	10	10	12				
Newspapers	53	57	51	60	58	55	68	46	49	47	39	49	55	51	50	54	60	49	53	50	64	46	45	52	56	59	70	50	55	53	57	49				
Did not state	1	1	1	—	—	2	3	1	—	1	—	1	1	1	2	1	3	—	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1			
<i>Allows you to see life as others live it</i>																																				
TV	83	85	88	86	87	83	79	77	89	91	100	86	84	84	82	84	79	83	83	85	79	84	85	84	83	80	85	84	82	80	86					
Radio	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	3	1	—	1	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2				
Newspapers	14	13	9	10	11	13	19	19	8	7	—	12	12	13	14	14	18	13	14	12	19	12	13	15	14	18	13	13	15	17	11					
Did not state	1	—	1	1	—	2	1	1	—	1	—	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
<i>Gives a sense of satisfaction</i>																																				
TV	51	48	46	44	44	41	49	67	73	54	61	53	53	53	53	45	49	45	52	54	37	58	56	57	48	45	36	56	52	46	50	52				
Radio	18	14	20	24	20	22	17	11	25	27	19	16	19	16	17	20	20	18	18	21	18	17	14	20	15	21	18	17	16	21						
Newspapers	27	32	30	31	36	30	27	21	16	15	12	25	27	25	26	32	26	32	26	25	35	22	24	25	28	34	36	20	26	32	31	23				
Did not state	4	6	4	1	—	7	7	1	—	6	—	3	4	3	5	6	5	3	4	3	7	2	3	4	4	6	7	3	4	5	3	4				
<i>Makes experts available</i>																																				
TV	56	50	49	60	48	51	42	70	67	64	51	62	62	55	56	49	52	55	56	57	51	58	63	57	50	52	51	64	58	49	54	58				
Radio	10	16	10	11	16	7	6	9	11	16	6	11	6	10	10	9	11	11	10	10	8	12	10	10	9	5	7	11	10	8	12					

Newspapers	32 32 38 28 36 39 47 20 19 19 33 26 29 31 32 39 34 34 32 31 38 28 26 30 38 40 39 24 30 39 36 28
Did not state	2 2 3 1 - 3 5 1 3 1 10 1 3 4 2 3 3 - 2 2 3 2 1 3 3 3 1 2 4 2 2

*Is easiest to learn from*

TV	75 77 78 80 70 72 70 79 81 77 74 81 74 75 79 74 72 74 76 75 77 74 76 79 73 74 72 76 80 69 73 77
Radio	5 7 4 5 5 6 5 6 3 6 5 4 8 4 6 4 8 6 5 6 5 4 7 5 6
Newspapers	19 15 17 16 25 22 22 15 8 15 20 16 19 15 22 19 21 18 19 17 16 18 16 21 19 21 18 15 23 21 16
Did not state	1 1 1 - - 1 2 - 6 2 - - 1 1 2 - 1 1 - - 2 2 - - 2 1 1 1 1 1 1

*Is easiest to relax with*

TV	61 59 56 50 50 53 66 77 84 51 71 62 62 61 56 58 63 58 61 61 58 61 63 61 59 59 57 62 62 58 59 62
Radio	28 32 35 35 35 34 24 16 8 36 23 27 29 31 26 33 26 28 28 28 32 27 26 29 29 30 32 32 28 28 29 29
Newspapers	10 9 9 14 15 12 8 7 8 12 6 11 9 8 17 9 9 14 10 11 9 12 11 10 11 10 10 6 10 13 12 9
Did not state	1 - - 1 - 1 2 - - 1 - - - 1 - 2 - 1 - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - -

*Gets below the surface of the news*

TV	31 29 29 25 22 31 23 38 43 31 41 27 34 35 37 34 28 24 33 33 27 36 33 34 33 25 26 32 32 31 31 33
Radio	11 12 10 8 14 8 5 13 24 21 18 13 9 11 7 12 11 14 11 11 9 13 13 10 9 11 6 11 11 11 9 12
Newspapers	56 57 58 66 64 58 68 49 30 47 41 59 57 53 53 51 59 61 55 54 62 50 52 55 56 63 65 55 57 59 53
Did not state	2 2 3 1 - 3 4 - 3 1 - 1 - 1 3 3 2 1 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 2

*Digs for the truth Attempts to find out all the facts*

TV	28 33 26 22 19 25 18 36 38 29 35 25 29 27 32 31 27 24 29 30 22 35 33 26 25 24 27 33 28 27 26 31
Radio	13 16 10 12 11 12 6 15 27 21 24 14 11 14 15 14 13 12 14 13 12 12 13 15 11 14 10 12 14 13 13 13
Newspapers	55 49 61 66 68 57 67 48 27 48 41 59 59 56 48 51 55 61 54 60 50 52 56 60 59 56 53 55 56 57 53
Did not state	4 2 3 - 2 6 9 1 8 2 - 2 1 3 5 4 5 3 3 3 6 3 2 3 4 3 7 2 3 4 4 3

*Tells the whole story Doesn't leave me up in the air*

TV	26 26 21 16 18 26 19 35 38 23 31 25 24 27 32 26 26 23 27 28 19 34 28 26 25 21 21 34 26 23 24 29
Radio	8 12 6 6 7 6 4 8 16 18 7 6 7 11 10 9 6 8 8 7 9 8 7 7 8 7 9 7 8 8 8
Newspapers	60 54 61 78 71 59 72 55 41 53 49 65 68 61 51 55 57 67 59 59 64 53 60 61 61 66 64 52 61 62 62 58
Did not state	6 8 12 - 4 9 5 2 5 6 2 3 2 5 6 9 8 4 6 5 10 4 4 6 7 5 8 5 6 7 6 5

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## CENSORSHIP OF MEDIA

*Table 59. Proponents of television censorship say:*

- "Too many children watch and learn from TV."
- "Too much violence otherwise."
- "A number of things just shouldn't be on for children."
- "We can't always be there to control what they watch."
- "They should avoid obscene shows."
- "They show too much already."
- "Too much violence and sex."
- "Especially of naked women."
- "We need to maintain our self-respect."
- "Some control is necessary, otherwise we'd get junk."

Those who do not believe television censorship is necessary express a general disagreement with the concept of censorship. They say:

- "Censorship in any form is undesirable."
- "I don't know who could set the standards."
- "Surely they have a conscience."
- "Censorship censors the best."
- "I'm against control."
- "We can turn it off if something displeases us."
- "Dangerous impact is comparatively trivial."
- "There's not that much on radio — news and music is about all."
- "You can always turn it off."

Many who believe radio censorship is necessary say profanity and swearing should be controlled. Others express concern that things would get out of hand in the absence of any control.

- "Everyone listens to it so you have to draw the line somewhere."
- "Too much put over the air would frighten too many people."
- "It's not always good to hear everything."

Many people consider the potential abuse of unlimited freedom on radio to be less dangerous than on TV.

- "There is nothing much to censor."
- "Radio doesn't have the visual impact."

People who believe newspaper censorship is required make the following comments:

- "Newspapers print the wrong information often."
- "Privately owned newspapers could become a propaganda medium."
- "They often print untruths to get people stirred up."
- "We want to know the truth and they don't always print it."

People against newspaper censorship say:

- "Control should not be exercised over news media."
- "As long as they tell the truth."
- "Freedom of the press is necessary."
- "People are entitled to know the facts."
- "Newspapers are more for adults than for children."
- "Everyone is free to buy the paper he wants."

Table 59. Opinion on Censorship of Media (Question 76)

% of individuals

Censorship and medium	Province*										Population centre		Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age	Sex																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
	Province*										Population centre				High school or less	College	Annual income																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M					5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M			100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
TV	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM v INFLUENCE OF ADVERTISING

*Table 60.* People who believe the school system is the more influential do so because:

"The things we learn at school we remember and stick to. Advertising goes in one ear and out the other."

"Our values are formed by the school system. Advertising is a choice."

"A lot of people don't even look at advertising."

"The school system affects people at a time when it means the most."

"I'm not influenced at all by advertising."

"Advertising is for adults only."

Some reasons why people say advertising has the greater influence are indicated by the following comments:

"Schooling is only in youth. Advertising is every day, everywhere."

"Advertising shows more about our way of life than anything else."

"Advertising penetrates our homes in spite of ourselves, from all angles."

"Advertising affects us unconsciously."





# TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS NEWSPAPER READING HABITS

Table 61. Amount of time spent reading newspaper and watching television (Questions 78 and 79)

	Province*										Population centre	Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age	Sex														
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.				Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M			Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
<i>Time spent reading a daily newspaper</i> (average in minutes)	31	33	30	28	35	38	33	31	34	31	26	30	28	30	33	32	34	29	32	32	28	33	32	31	32	30	29	28	29	31	34	31	32	
	Per Cent																																	
<i>Number of hours of TV</i> <i>watched per week</i>																																		
1 or less	3	4	2	1	4	3	7	1	—	—	—	2	2	3	4	2	4	3	2	2	5	2	2	1	2	3	7	3	1	2	4	3	2	
2-5	16	15	20	16	21	19	20	10	11	13	23	18	15	15	13	19	18	19	16	14	25	13	13	15	18	16	27	16	12	16	18	18	15	
6-10	22	21	28	21	24	23	24	19	13	23	27	21	22	22	16	27	21	29	22	21	28	21	19	21	22	27	25	23	22	21	24	23	21	
11-15	18	23	16	15	18	13	18	19	19	16	20	14	17	24	16	17	17	18	18	16	16	18	19	20	18	15	16	22	19	16	19	17		
16-20	14	8	17	14	17	12	13	18	27	14	16	15	20	14	12	13	15	14	15	11	13	18	16	13	15	11	13	14	16	12	14	15		
21-30	15	18	9	19	10	14	14	18	14	16	4	15	16	17	14	12	15	9	16	16	10	18	16	16	15	15	8	17	16	14	15	13	16	
Over 30	11	10	8	14	5	10	8	16	16	15	14	9	10	12	14	12	11	7	11	13	4	17	13	12	10	6	5	12	13	11	11	10	13	
Did not state	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	1	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# MEDIA SENSATIONALISM

Table 62. Opinion on Most Sensational Medium (Question 80)  
% of individuals

Medium chosen as most sensational	Province*										Population centre		Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age												
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.			Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M		Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 25
TV . . . . .	81	79	86	94	85	75	73	89	89	86	88	90	86	83	86	76	74	89	81	84	73	86	85	84	83	82	66	66	84	83	79	1
Radio . . . . .	4	4	4	2	3	4	6	4	-	2	12	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	5
Newspapers . . . . .	14	16	10	4	12	20	19	7	8	12	-	6	11	13	9	21	6	15	11	23	10	10	11	14	15	29	11	13	16	9	16	19
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## CANADIAN v AMERICAN TV PROGRAMMES

*Table 63.* People say they prefer American programmes because:

- "All the best talent including Canadian has gone to the States."
- "They're more professional."
- "Canadian shows with their high ideals are too self-conscious in their presentation. American shows at their worst are pretty slick."
- "There isn't too much choice."
- "More varied programmes."
- "CBC shows are boring and uninteresting."
- "They have a better view of what the public wants."
- "That's where most of the movies come from."

Those who choose Canadian programmes explain:

- "Because they're produced by Canadians."
- "Because it's our way of life. They resemble us more than American shows."
- "We have to encourage our own artists."
- "I'm not bilingual."
- "Most of the artists are French-Canadian."

Table 63. Canadian v American Media (Questions 81 and 82)

% of individuals

Prefer	Province*					Population centre					Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation					Annual income					Age											
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44		
Canadian Shows	35	28	26	23	23	24	33	69	32	16	18	41	40	35	35	23	37	40	35	35	37	48	38	35	29	26	34	30	29	32	43		
American Shows	60	66	70	70	74	70	60	29	68	82	80	54	57	61	62	72	57	54	61	61	56	48	57	62	67	71	60	68	67	64	51		
Did not state	5	6	4	7	3	6	7	2	—	2	2	5	3	4	3	5	6	6	4	4	7	4	5	3	4	3	6	2	4	4	6		
Canadian TV	43	34	33	31	32	29	45	80	35	32	29	50	45	42	40	32	46	46	43	42	48	56	47	41	38	34	44	40	38	38	52		
American TV	54	59	63	68	67	66	50	20	65	68	71	47	53	55	58	65	49	51	54	55	47	42	50	57	58	61	53	58	58	59	45		
Did not state	3	7	4	1	1	5	5	—	—	—	3	2	3	2	3	5	3	3	3	5	2	3	2	4	5	3	2	4	3	3			
Canadian Radio	92	89	92	91	97	92	95	94	84	93	88	90	92	91	95	93	95	91	93	92	94	90	91	94	94	93	85	90	94	93			
American Radio	4	3	5	3	4	1	4	5	6	8	5	4	6	2	4	3	5	4	4	3	5	4	3	5	4	3	1	4	12	6	3		
Did not state	4	8	3	4	—	4	4	2	11	1	4	5	4	3	3	2	4	3	4	4	3	5	5	2	3	6	3	3	4	3			
Canadian Newspapers	94	95	93	96	99	94	91	95	84	97	86	93	94	94	95	95	95	94	94	94	94	91	94	95	96	96	96	93	93	95	95		
American Newspapers	2	1	3	3	1	2	5	1	3	2	10	1	3	2	1	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	3	2	5	2	5	2		
Did not state	4	4	4	1	—	4	4	4	13	1	4	6	3	4	4	2	2	5	4	4	3	7	5	2	2	1	2	2	2	3			
Canadian Magazines	56	41	55	59	54	51	44	76	49	49	29	68	60	52	53	51	51	71	55	59	47	63	64	60	54	47	40	49	51	53			
American Magazines	37	46	40	39	44	41	46	18	38	49	67	26	35	42	37	43	40	24	38	33	50	23	28	35	41	46	55	47	46	41			
Did not state	7	13	5	2	2	8	10	6	13	2	4	6	5	6	10	6	9	5	7	8	3	14	8	5	5	7	5	4	3				

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## MEDIA AND PEOPLE'S PRIVACY

Table 64. Media, in General and in Particular, and Personal Privacy (Questions 83 and 84)  
% of individuals

	Province*					Population centre					Edu- cation	Annual income					Age												
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.		Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44
<i>Media invade privacy</i>																													
Yes	55	58	50	63	49	51	57	65	46	45	55	52	59	57	61	55	53	53	63	50	51	56	60	54	65	59	59	56	54
No	44	41	49	37	50	47	43	35	54	55	45	48	41	42	39	44	46	46	36	49	49	43	39	45	35	40	39	44	46
Did not state	1	1	1	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	—	1	2	—	—
<i>Medium most intrusive</i>																													
TV	42	31	32	37	33	28	40	76	30	37	45	45	52	42	45	29	41	42	42	45	45	43	43	36	39	40	39	43	42
Radio	2	4	3	2	2	2	4	2	—	—	—	3	1	3	—	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	2
Newspapers	37	41	41	43	53	44	31	18	43	43	24	36	33	31	40	47	33	36	38	33	34	36	36	41	39	43	44	37	33
Did not state	19	24	24	18	12	26	25	4	27	19	31	16	14	24	15	22	23	20	17	20	18	18	18	22	21	15	15	18	23

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



Table 65. Opinion on Profanity in the Media (Question 85)  
% of individuals

	Province*										Edu- cation	Annual income						Age							
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	Fr.	N.B.		N.S.	Nfld.	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
Four-letter words should be permitted in																									
<i>Newspapers</i>																									
Yes	14	23	10	12	9	20	23	4	24	19	12	12	22	12	12	12	16	17	21	24	23	14	10		
No	85	76	90	88	90	79	76	96	76	80	84	87	77	88	88	87	84	82	78	76	76	85	89		
Did not state	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	4	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1		
<i>Magazines</i>																									
Yes	17	28	15	15	10	23	24	3	24	21	20	14	27	12	12	14	18	24	26	27	27	17	11		
No	82	71	85	85	89	75	75	97	76	77	78	85	72	88	87	85	82	75	73	73	72	82	88		
Did not state	1	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	2	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1		
<i>Television</i>																									
Yes	12	15	9	6	9	18	21	3	19	19	10	10	20	9	10	10	13	13	20	23	20	12	8		
No	87	84	91	94	90	81	78	97	81	80	86	89	79	91	89	89	87	85	79	77	79	88	91		
Did not state	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	4	1	1	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	1	-	1		
<i>Radio</i>																									
Yes	11	13	9	7	6	17	19	3	19	18	6	9	19	8	9	9	12	13	19	21	17	10	8		
No	88	86	91	92	93	82	80	97	81	81	90	90	80	92	90	90	88	85	80	79	81	89	90		
Did not state	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	4	1	1	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	2	1	2		

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# EFFECT OF MEDIA ON ATTITUDES TO THE UNITED STATES AND TO FRENCH CANADA

Table 66. Opinion on Effect of Media on Attitudes to the United States and to French Canadians (Questions 86 and 87)  
% of individuals

	Province *										Population centre		Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age													
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M			5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
Media foster																																	
Friendship with US . . . . .	77	76	76	84	80	75	79	78	62	81	88	83	76	77	79	76	74	82	76	79	70	78	81	78	76	77	74	72	68	78	80		
Animosity . . . . .	18	21	19	15	19	20	15	16	24	17	10	15	21	14	15	20	22	13	19	17	23	18	16	17	21	19	22	25	28	17	15		
Did not state . . . . .	5	3	5	1	1	5	6	6	14	2	2	2	3	9	6	4	4	5	5	4	7	4	3	5	3	4	4	3	4	5	5		
Understanding of Fr. Can. desires . . . . .	52	38	33	46	36	47	57	74	60	51	65	57	60	49	53	41	55	57	52	55	42	58	58	54	47	54	43	45	41	52	59		
Resentment of Fr. Can. desires . . . . .	43	57	64	50	63	48	37	20	32	46	35	40	38	42	42	53	39	41	43	40	53	35	38	42	47	43	52	51	52	44	36		
Did not state . . . . .	5	5	3	4	1	5	6	6	8	3	—	3	2	9	5	6	6	2	5	5	5	7	4	4	6	3	5	4	7	4	5		

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## THE FREEDOM OF THE MEDIA

*Table 67.* The majority of Canadian people (76 per cent) do not feel that the media have too much freedom.

"If you cut out the freedom, you wouldn't get anything you want."

"They don't abuse a privilege."

"To do their work objectively they must have complete freedom."

"There can't be too much freedom when the truth is being told and the public is being informed."

"The dangers of control outweigh the abuses of freedom."

"As long as they tell the truth."

"The information on separatism is somewhat censored," (French-Canadian comment)

Those who feel media have too much freedom say:

"Too many details about bad things and too little about the good things."

"The advertiser through television has too much influence over a captive audience."

"They pry too much in private affairs."

"If you're in trouble, it's published before you have a chance to defend yourself."

"They make the private lives of people become street gossip."

Table 67. Opinion on the Freedom of Media (Questions 88, 89, 90)  
% of individuals

	Province*										Population centre								Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age				Sex								
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural			Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000		Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female		
Media freedom																																						
Media have too much freedom																																						
Yes	22	21	30	23	20	17	26	16	20	20	26	24	24	15	24	18	24	22	22	22	21	25	20	25	21	20	20	24	20	24	20	24	20	24	20	24	20	24
No	76	77	68	77	78	81	72	84	74	76	73	75	74	83	74	79	75	76	76	77	71	78	73	78	78	75	78	74	78	74	78	74	78	74	78	74	78	
Did not state	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	6	4	1	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Medium which is public protector																																						
TV	25	18	17	28	24	22	19	38	24	17	26	27	29	23	34	20	23	23	26	27	18	30	29	26	22	26	16	33	35	25	21	24	27	27	24	27	24	
Radio	22	35	26	33	35	17	29	14	22	30	33	21	19	17	29	22	22	22	22	22	20	22	20	22	23	21	18	25	25	24	23	19	20	24	24	24	24	
Newspapers	47	44	50	33	39	53	49	42	54	46	31	48	50	48	45	46	45	49	47	45	54	43	43	44	51	52	53	38	36	46	52	50	43	43	43	43	43	
Did not state	6	3	7	6	2	8	3	6	—	7	10	4	2	10	4	5	10	6	5	6	9	6	7	6	7	6	4	6	4	5	6	8	6	9	6	6		
Intermedia criticism																																						
Yes	46	64	58	44	43	54	60	19	38	54	39	39	38	43	61	50	35	47	39	69	35	34	43	49	63	67	36	44	47	47	51	40	40	40	40	40		
No	53	35	41	56	57	44	39	80	62	43	61	61	60	61	56	38	48	65	52	60	29	64	65	57	50	36	33	64	56	52	52	48	59	59	59	59	59	
Did not state	1	1	1	—	—	2	1	1	—	3	—	—	1	1	1	1	2	—	1	2	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## AMOUNT OF NEWS

Table 68. Opinion on Amount of News Currently Available (Question 91)  
% of individuals

Would prefer	Province*										Annual income					Age					
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44
							Eng.	Fr.													
More news daily . . . . .	29	25	26	25	23	28	34	29	40	42	31	31	27	27	31	30	32	26	35	29	28
The same amount as now . . . . .	68	73	70	72	75	68	63	69	60	56	67	66	72	70	67	64	64	67	63	68	70
Less news daily . . . . .	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	—	2	2	3	1	2	1	5	3	5	1	2	2
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	2	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	—

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## MEDIA AND GOVERNMENT CRITICISM

Table 69. Opinion on Media and Criticism of Government (Questions 92 and 93)  
% of individuals

	Province*										Population centre	Com- mu- nity	Education	Annual income					Age	Sex																	
Media criticism of government	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Quebec	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	% Male	% Female				
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%			
<i>Medium most critical of government actions</i>																																					
TV	20	18	21	33	22	22	14	15	30	28	23	21	22	19	28	20	16	19	20	22	13	21	23	23	20	19	12	18	25	20	20	20	19	21	21		
Radio	8	11	9	5	6	6	8	8	33	13	14	8	6	8	4	9	10	6	8	7	8	9	6	10	5	6	7	10	8	7	8	7	7	8	8		
Newspapers	68	66	64	59	70	67	76	75	54	57	63	68	70	68	63	68	69	71	68	67	76	64	68	63	71	72	78	69	64	69	68	70	67	67			
Did not state	4	5	6	3	2	5	2	2	13	2	—	3	2	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	3	6	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	4	4			
<i>Media are</i>																																					
Too critical of gov't	15	15	13	12	13	14	9	20	13	15	6	15	15	17	16	13	15	15	15	15	14	17	14	14	14	9	21	22	19	13	15	15	13	16			
Doing a good job	54	41	50	45	64	52	65	59	57	36	59	55	58	55	54	48	53	56	53	55	48	55	57	52	50	58	49	44	45	57	54	52	56				
Not critical enough	29	43	35	43	22	30	24	20	22	49	33	28	26	25	27	37	30	27	29	28	35	27	32	34	30	29	32	35	29	28	33	25					
Did not state	2	1	2	—	1	4	2	1	8	—	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	3	2	3				

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



## ADVICE AND OPINION FROM THE MEDIA

Table 70. People say they like columns like "Dear Abby" and "Ann Landers" because:

- "It's amusing, humorous." (Many respondents)
- "Human interest, interest in people's problems."
- "Practical good sense."
- "It could happen to me."
- "Everyone is curious."

Those who don't like "Dear Abby" and "Ann Landers" say:

- "I don't like the way private lives are shown."
- "It's just family fights."
- "I don't believe in it."
- "I think she's an idiot."

Those who read "Playboy Advisor" say it is "entertaining" or that they read it because they are "curious about boy-girl relationships."

People read horoscopes because:

- "I want to know what's going to become of me the next day."
- "I kind of follow the moon."
- "I want to see if they're true or false."
- "They're interesting."

Others who dislike horoscopes say:

- "They are trying to make superstitious people put their faith in something that isn't true."
- "I don't believe in it."
- "They're silly."

People listen to "hot-line" programmes because:

- "They emphasize local problems."
- "There is a personal touch."
- "They give you something to think about."
- "You can contradict statements and listen to arguments."
- "I want to know what's going on and listen to other people's opinions."
- "People get excited about some subjects and you learn a lot from them."
- "It helps me form my own opinion."
- "It's real. It's the people's opinion."

Those who do not like radio "hot-lines" say:

- "They're made for people with nothing else better to do."
- "I dislike Gordon Sinclair's lack of courtesy to some of the guests."
- "All they do is argue when they get on the phone."
- "They make me mad sometimes. People call with nothing to say just to hear themselves talk."
- "People get nasty."
- "The commentators are too abrupt."
- "They avoid questions."

"They are biased. Some abuse these programs."

"I don't like the way they cut the line off."

People say they find TV panel shows "educational," "informative," "interesting," and "entertaining."

"You have to think and be alert."

"Sometimes it's controversial."

"They talk about national issues."

"I like to hear different opinions."

"You get the views of other people that are supposed to be smarter than you are."

"They let you know how intelligent and how dumb some people can be."

"Helps me make political choices."

"I like the willingness and openness of the provincial politicians or those representing the school commission" (French).

People who dislike television panel shows say:

"People get nasty."

"There's a few that are so lewd they're embarrassing."

"They avoid questions."

"I don't like the bias."

"Some commentators are rude."

Table 70. Opinion of Advice and Opinion in Media (Question 94a)

% of individuals

	Province*										Population centre						Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income						Age		Sex								
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M			Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000		10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
Read, Watch, listen to																																			
<i>Dear Abby</i>																																			
Very regularly . . . . .	21	28	19	7	30	29	23	10	3	17	18	19	14	22	19	29	21	12	22	22	18	16	17	23	25	22	20	15	23	21	13	29			
Sometimes . . . . .	18	23	17	9	15	21	16	17	11	11	19	17	17	22	13	18	20	16	18	18	17	17	20	15	19	20	18	17	21	18	17	14	22		
Rarely . . . . .	9	8	9	10	11	10	8	19	2	10	8	11	10	10	7	11	9	10	9	11	9	11	9	10	8	11	7	12	11	8	10	9			
Never . . . . .	51	41	56	75	44	38	51	65	65	70	53	56	57	46	58	46	47	62	50	50	53	58	51	53	46	47	49	55	52	48	54	62	40		
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	—	—	1	1	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	
<i>Playboy Advisor</i>																																			
Very regularly . . . . .	2	3	2	3	—	2	6	3	5	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	2	5	4	5	5	2	1	4	1		
Sometimes . . . . .	10	13	8	4	7	11	13	11	8	2	6	8	9	12	11	12	5	10	9	13	7	8	10	13	13	12	22	18	9	5	15	5			
Rarely . . . . .	7	10	4	10	4	6	10	7	16	9	6	8	6	10	9	4	7	8	7	8	7	6	6	7	8	9	11	13	7	5	9	5			
Never . . . . .	80	74	84	84	89	80	71	79	68	87	84	82	82	78	76	81	77	84	80	81	75	84	84	80	77	73	75	62	63	81	88	71	88		
Did not state . . . . .	1	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	3	—	2	—	1	—	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<i>Horoscopes</i>																																			
Very regularly . . . . .	18	11	25	4	18	19	16	18	8	34	26	16	16	18	16	23	17	11	19	20	11	20	16	19	19	18	14	28	15	18	16	11	25		
Sometimes . . . . .	26	25	25	21	24	32	18	24	19	16	27	23	27	27	30	24	28	25	26	27	23	21	27	28	26	30	29	35	33	27	22	23	30		
Rarely . . . . .	13	20	17	17	10	12	12	14	19	3	6	12	12	16	14	13	14	11	14	12	19	9	13	15	14	16	14	12	19	15	11	13	13		

Table 70. Opinion of Advice and Opinion in Media (Question 94a) — *Continued*  
% of individuals

	Province*					Population centre					Com- muni- ty	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age			Sex														
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.			Nfld.	Under 5M	5M-20M	20M-50M	50M-100M	100M-500M	Over 500M	Rural		Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male
Read, Watch, listen to																																			
Never . . . . .	42	33	58	48	36	54	43	49	47	41	48	44	38	39	40	40	52	40	46	48	43	37	41	36	42	24	32	40	51	52	31				
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	—	—	1	—	1	5	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	1	1
Telephone Radio Programmes in which people ask an announcer questions																																			
Very regularly . . . . .	15	17	18	22	22	12	8	15	19	28	18	16	14	19	12	17	13	16	15	16	12	16	19	16	15	13	9	10	13	14	19	13	17		
Sometimes . . . . .	36	31	38	45	44	41	26	27	41	39	41	41	36	39	41	34	27	38	35	37	32	37	38	40	35	36	29	35	36	38	33	35	37		
Rarely . . . . .	15	15	16	15	11	17	13	15	16	7	18	14	19	11	16	15	17	13	15	14	18	12	16	13	16	18	20	12	16	14	16	15			
Never . . . . .	34	37	28	18	23	30	53	43	24	26	23	29	31	31	31	34	43	33	35	33	39	35	27	31	34	35	44	35	37	32	34	36	31		
TV Panel Shows																																			
Very regularly . . . . .	28	19	28	34	41	21	22	37	35	32	27	34	32	23	24	23	27	29	28	29	25	37	30	31	24	22	19	17	23	24	37	25	31		
Sometimes . . . . .	45	46	50	55	36	48	46	37	52	45	49	47	45	53	42	43	40	50	44	47	37	46	43	49	48	47	48	47	47	47	41	45	45		
Rarely . . . . .	13	20	15	8	9	15	12	9	5	16	12	9	12	8	17	18	15	10	13	13	14	8	10	14	14	15	17	20	13	14	9	14	12		
Never . . . . .	14	15	7	3	14	16	20	17	8	7	12	10	11	16	17	16	18	11	15	14	13	18	14	12	13	15	17	15	16	15	13	16	12		

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 71. Opinion on Local as against Absentee Ownership of Local Media; Knowledge of Political Affiliation of Local Media and Opinion of Effectiveness (Questions 95 to 100)

% of individuals

	Province*										Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income					Age				Sex					
Know owners of local	Quebec										Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.																Nfld.	Rural
<i>TV station(s)</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes .....	39	28	37	55	38	40	32	40	41	48	37	43	39	36	49	32	36	40	43	46	48	27	31	40	43	44	35
No .....	59	70	62	44	62	57	66	59	59	52	59	54	60	62	50	67	62	59	54	52	50	71	66	59	55	54	64
Did not state .....	2	2	1	1	—	3	2	1	—	4	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1
<i>Newspaper(s)</i>																											
Yes .....	42	36	41	39	46	48	29	33	62	46	43	44	41	39	52	37	38	39	44	43	57	26	29	41	50	48	36
No .....	57	63	57	61	54	49	71	67	38	54	53	54	57	60	46	62	60	59	54	55	41	72	70	58	48	50	64
Did not state .....	1	1	2	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	4	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	—
<i>Radio station(s)</i>																											
Yes .....	32	31	32	41	33	33	25	27	38	47	45	35	32	30	40	27	30	33	32	37	39	25	22	34	34	37	27
No .....	65	66	66	58	65	63	71	72	62	49	47	61	66	68	57	72	67	65	65	61	56	73	76	65	64	59	71
Did not state .....	3	3	2	1	2	4	4	1	—	4	8	4	2	2	3	1	3	2	3	2	5	2	2	1	2	4	2

Table 71. Opinion on Local as against Absentee Ownership of Local Media; Knowledge of Political Affiliation of Local Media and Opinion of Effectiveness (Questions 95 to 100) - *Continued*  
 % of individuals

	Province*										Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income						Age				Sex						
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.			Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000		Over 12,000	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male
<i>Interested in ownership of local TV station(s)</i>																													
Interested . . . . .	29	43	36	22	35	32	32	22	19	15	14	30	30	26	43	19	25	28	35	31	42	30	30	31	27	32	32	26	
Doesn't matter . . . . .	70	56	64	78	65	67	68	78	81	85	86	70	70	74	57	81	75	72	65	69	57	69	69	69	73	67	74		
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-		
<i>Interested in ownership of local newspaper(s)</i>																													
Interested . . . . .	32	45	42	26	36	36	34	23	27	23	18	29	33	28	49	20	28	31	37	38	48	31	36	34	30	36	29		
Doesn't matter . . . . .	67	54	58	74	64	63	66	77	73	77	80	71	67	72	51	80	72	68	62	61	52	69	63	66	70	64	71		
Did not state . . . . .	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-		
<i>Interested in ownership of local radio station(s)</i>																													
Interested . . . . .	30	44	34	22	37	34	31	20	19	16	18	29	30	26	43	18	26	29	36	33	40	30	32	31	28	32	27		
Doesn't matter . . . . .	70	55	66	78	63	64	69	80	81	84	82	71	70	73	57	81	74	71	63	67	60	70	68	68	72	67	72		
Did not state . . . . .	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1		



*Know political affiliation of  
local*

TV station(s) . . . . .	13	16	6	16	10	14	22	13	8	18	12	11	14	11	23	8	10	13	13	20	24	14	16	13	14	18	9
Newspaper(s) . . . . .	32	41	27	28	29	37	39	22	19	36	18	24	33	26	52	20	24	27	36	44	52	24	26	31	36	37	26
Radio station(s) . . . . .	12	17	7	13	9	11	20	11	8	17	12	9	12	10	19	9	10	10	12	15	19	13	12	10	14	15	8

*Political positions influenced by  
local*

TV station(s) . . . . .	19	18	24	18	21	17	22	21	16	11	6	14	19	17	27	13	14	18	20	21	31	32	23	17	16	19	18
Newspaper(s) . . . . .	21	20	25	17	26	21	26	23	19	11	8	19	22	19	31	15	17	20	21	21	38	32	23	20	19	23	20
Radio station(s) . . . . .	14	16	16	9	17	14	20	13	14	7	2	11	14	12	19	10	12	13	14	17	21	19	17	13	12	14	13

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Question 101. The favourite newspapers of people in major cities in Canada are as follows:

Vancouver	— <i>Sun</i>
Calgary	— <i>Herald</i>
Edmonton	— <i>Journal</i>
Regina	— <i>Leader-Post</i>
Winnipeg	— <i>Winnipeg Free Press</i>
Toronto	— <i>Daily Star</i>
Ottawa	— <i>Citizen</i>
Montreal	— <i>La Presse</i>
(English)	— <i>Star</i>
Quebec	— <i>Le Soleil</i>
Saint John	— <i>Evening Times-Globe</i>
Halifax	— <i>Mail-Star</i>

The same papers are considered the most influential in their respective areas.

As far as a national newspaper is concerned, the one paper most frequently mentioned by English-speaking people outside that paper's home city is the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. For French-speaking Canadians, *La Presse* and *Le Devoir*, in that order, are the papers most frequently mentioned.

Table 72. Opinion on Need for National Newspaper (Question 103)

% of individuals

	Province*											Education	Sex		
	Quebec											High school or less	College	Male	Female
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.				
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes . . . . .	16	11	15	15	18	16	12	19	22	18	8	15	19	20	12
No . . . . .	81	81	69	65	73	72	82	69	70	75	59	72	71	70	74
Did not state . .	3	8	16	20	9	12	6	12	8	7	33	13	10	10	14

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

## CANADIAN CONTROL OF MEDIA

Table 73. About half the people who want government controls retained are concerned about an increase in exposure to scenes of violence, drug taking and sex if TV were left uncontrolled.

"Everything would be drugs, sex and violence."

"Controls are needed in one's own actions, emotions and words, why should TV be different."

"For the concern of the general public, television has the advantages of pictures which could be damaging."

"They have to have some censorship."

"They drag all the filth in now. If there were no controls children would be exposed to things that are now shown in the local movie houses."

About one in five Canadians worry about foreign and commercial influences dominating the media. Some are concerned about subversion from the left.

"It is foolish to allow steps toward anarchy. The objectives of our government deserve consideration."

"If there was no supervision there would be no guarantee that commercial or foreign interests would not take over."

"Then television might bend to advertising pressures."

"Someone might put on adverse shows like communism etc. Things against our country's interest."

People who would like to see the government giving up its control over TV generally give as their reason that TV should be free to manage its own affairs the way newspapers do.

Some dislike the idea of government being associated with news and political coverage.

Most reasons given for wanting government controls retained tend to be vague. They say they are satisfied the way things are now or simply agree that some form of control is probably needed. Many add that although controls may be required they do not want to see censorship.

"I like the way it is now."

"They should control quality but I don't want to see censorship."

"They should set standards."

"It's just necessary. That's all."

"Supervision without censorship."

Some believe that public morality must be considered and control is necessary. A few worry about subversion.

"Someone might promote communism."

"Things like drug addiction shouldn't be on."

"A lot of things would be on that young people shouldn't hear."

Those who would like to see government controls discontinued are mainly concerned about government controlling the news. Most stress that radio should be a free medium.

"It is an important news medium."

"Freedom should apply to radio."

"The media should be separate from government."

"We want facts, nothing hidden."

"The less control government has, the better off the country will be."

Those who do not want government control over the press stress the importance in a free society of the freedom of the press.

"Freedom of the press is important."

"That *is* freedom."

"They wouldn't be able to print anything the government didn't want."

"Freedom of the press. If they go too far people can always stop buying."

"Why should they? This is a free country so they tell us."

"We want to hear points of view which are not those of the government."

Table 73. Opinion on Canadian Control of Media (Questions 106 and 107)

% of individuals																
Canadian control of medium	Province *												Edu- cation	Sex		
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Quebec						High school or less	College	Male	Female	
						Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.					
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Newspapers</i>																
Too much . . . .	9	13	9	7	8	7	7	11	11	15	6	9	9	10	7	
Just enough . . .	69	57	67	71	84	68	67	71	70	65	76	70	65	67	71	
Too little . . . .	17	23	18	18	7	19	19	15	11	12	16	16	19	18	16	
Did not state . . .	5	7	6	4	1	6	7	3	8	8	2	5	7	5	6	
<i>Radio</i>																
Too much . . . .	7	11	9	4	5	5	5	9	3	13	12	7	6	9	6	
Just enough . . .	76	67	75	85	90	75	71	79	84	72	76	77	74	73	79	
Too little . . . .	11	15	10	7	4	14	16	9	8	7	6	11	12	13	9	
Did not state . . .	6	7	6	4	1	6	8	3	5	8	6	5	8	5	6	
<i>TV</i>																
Too much . . . .	11	15	13	7	10	10	7	10	11	19	8	11	12	12	9	
Just enough . . .	61	50	54	62	56	59	4	71	65	48	63	62	54	60	61	
Too little . . . .	24	29	29	27	34	25	19	17	19	27	22	23	27	24	24	
Did not state . . .	4	6	4	4	—	6	10	2	6	6	7	4	7	4	6	
<i>Government to stop supervising TV</i>																
Yes . . . . .	33	35	35	42	25	33	29	30	38	46	33	34	30	37	30	
No . . . . .	64	62	62	52	75	64	70	67	60	54	59	64	67	61	67	
Did not state . . .	3	3	3	6	—	3	1	3	2	—	8	2	3	2	3	
<i>Government to stop supervising radio</i>																
Yes . . . . .	33	38	35	42	30	33	27	29	43	47	35	34	30	38	29	
No . . . . .	62	59	62	52	69	62	64	66	54	53	55	61	65	59	65	
Did not state . . .	5	3	3	6	1	5	9	5	3	—	10	5	5	3	6	
<i>Government should supervise newspapers</i>																
Yes . . . . .	19	14	15	8	16	15	17	33	11	8	22	20	15	19	20	
No . . . . .	79	85	83	89	84	81	83	66	89	92	71	78	83	80	78	
Did not state . . .	2	1	2	3	—	4	—	1	—	—	7	2	2	1	2	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# FAIRNESS OF MEDIA TO POLICE

**Table 74. Opinion on Media Attitudes to Police (Question 108)**

% of individuals

Medium and attitude to police	Province*											Education	Age	Sex					
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Quebec		N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.								
	%	%	%	%	%	%	Eng.	Fr.	%	%	%	High school or less	College	Under 20	20-24	25-44	Over 44	Male	Female
<i>Television</i>																			
Very fair .....	38	36	43	44	33	35	42	41	35	40	39	40	33	37	39	37	40	42	35
Just fair .....	40	42	34	32	39	41	41	41	54	35	38	40	41	35	39	42	38	38	42
Not fair .....	20	21	22	24	28	21	13	17	8	24	22	19	23	26	21	19	20	19	22
Did not state .....	2	1	1	-	-	3	4	1	3	1	1	1	3	2	1	2	2	1	1
<i>Radio</i>																			
Very fair .....	42	46	47	51	46	43	41	36	49	47	31	43	39	34	38	43	45	45	40
Just fair .....	45	46	42	42	43	43	45	50	41	45	61	45	47	52	47	46	41	43	48
Not fair .....	10	6	11	5	10	10	8	11	8	8	2	9	10	12	13	8	10	10	9
Did not state .....	3	2	-	2	1	4	6	3	2	-	-	3	4	2	2	3	4	2	3
<i>Newspapers</i>																			
Very fair .....	39	40	45	50	44	39	37	32	41	45	35	40	34	33	30	38	44	41	36
Just fair .....	43	46	38	39	36	42	42	47	46	37	41	43	43	40	44	46	39	40	46
Not fair .....	16	13	16	11	20	17	15	18	11	17	16	15	20	24	24	14	15	17	16
Did not state .....	2	1	1	-	-	2	6	3	2	1	8	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

# INFORMATION ABOUT RESPONDENTS

**Table 75. Newspapers received daily (Basic Data, A)**  
% of individuals

Province*														Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income														
Quebec																														
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000									
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%									
None .....	13	11	13	38	19	8	8	19	19	8	20	26	12	15	9	25	18	11	11	8	5									
One .....	66	64	77	55	64	69	52	61	70	84	71	62	67	68	58	64	71	69	67	68	52									
Two .....	17	24	10	6	16	19	29	15	8	6	6	11	17	14	26	11	10	16	18	20	32									
Three or more ...	4	1	-	1	1	4	11	5	3	2	3	1	4	3	7	-	1	4	4	4	11									

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

**Table 76. Radios in home (Basic Data B)**  
% of individuals

	Province*												Com- mu- nity	Edu- cation	Annual income							
	Quebec																					
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Rural	Urban	High school or less	College	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
None .....	2	1	1	-	2	2	3	2	-	5	-			2	1	5	2	1	-	1	-	
One .....	26	23	18	29	21	21	28	36	35	22	37			28	20	40	37	29	15	17	12	
Two .....	30	33	32	28	33	30	25	30	43	29	22			31	29	28	33	31	34	33	26	
Three .....	21	19	21	20	20	22	25	18	14	21	20			21	21	17	18	21	27	18	19	
Four or more ....	21	24	28	23	24	25	19	14	8	23	21			18	29	10	10	19	24	31	43	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.



Table 77. Television in home (Basic Data, C)

% of individuals

	Province*											Annual Income						
	Total	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Quebec	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	N.S.	Nfld.	Under \$4,000	4,001-6,000	6,001-8,000	8,001-10,000	10,001-12,000	Over 12,000
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
None .....	4	4	4	4	9	3	10	3	3	5	4	5	5	3	4	2	4	
One .....	63	68	58	63	64	61	56	65	70	61	69	78	73	69	56	52	39	
Two .....	28	25	32	30	22	29	29	26	27	30	22	16	20	24	33	40	43	
Three or more ..	5	3	6	3	5	7	5	6	—	4	5	1	2	4	7	6	14	

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 78. Cable Television in home (Basic Data, D)

% of individuals

Total	Province*									
	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Quebec	Ont.	Eng.	Fr.	N.B.	Nfld.
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
20	46	9	5	10	27	29	15	—	—	4

\*Prince Edward Island and Maritime French Canadian not included in break because base too small, but included in Canada total.

Table 79. Income Categories (Basic Data, H)

% of Respondents

Under \$4,000 .....	14
4,001 — 6,000 .....	20
6,001 — 8,000 .....	22
8,001 — 10,000 .....	15
10,001 — 12,000 .....	9
over \$12,000 .....	13
Refused .....	7

Table 80. Sex (Basic Data, I)

% of Respondents

Male .....	50
Female .....	50

Table 81. Community (Basic Data, F)

	% of Respondents
Farmer . . . . .	10
Non-farmer . . . . .	90

Table 82. Province (Basic Data, G)

	% of Respondents	Sample Size
British Columbia . . . . .	9.1	206
Alberta . . . . .	7.8	175
Saskatchewan . . . . .	4.6	103
Manitoba . . . . .	5.1	115
Ontario . . . . .	35.9	810
Quebec English . . . . .	5.3	119
Quebec French . . . . .	23.0	519
New Brunswick . . . . .	1.6	37
Nova Scotia . . . . .	3.7	83
Prince Edward Island . . . . .	0.4	9*
Newfoundland . . . . .	2.2	49
Maritime French . . . . .	1.3	29*
	100.0	2,254

\*Because of the small sample size caution should be used in interpreting statistics for Prince Edward Island and Maritime French.

Table 83. Education Categories (Basic Data, E)

	% of Respondents
Elementary school . . . . .	19
Some high school . . . . .	33
Completed high school . . . . .	26
Some college . . . . .	11
Completed college . . . . .	6
Graduate school . . . . .	4
Did not state . . . . .	1

Table 84. Age Categories (Basic Data, F)

	% of Respondents
Under 20 . . . . .	11
20 - 24 . . . . .	8
24 - 34 . . . . .	22
35 - 44 . . . . .	25
45 - 54 . . . . .	18
55 and over . . . . .	16

Table 85. Population (Basic Data, G)

	% of Respondents
Less than 5M . . . . .	21
5M — 20M . . . . .	14
20M — 50M . . . . .	13
50M — 100M . . . . .	11
100M — 500M . . . . .	17
over 500M . . . . .	24

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE USED

Good evening. I am \_\_\_\_\_ from Martin Goldfarb Consultants. We are conducting a study for the Senate of Canada. Could you please spend about an hour with me to answer some questions. They are of utmost importance, and I believe that you will find them interesting. Many thanks.

- 1 When you think of the word "press," what comes to your mind?

<i>Do not read aloud.</i>	TV	1
<i>Probe after</i>	Radio	1
<i>first reaction.</i>	Newspapers	1
<i>Circle as many</i>	Magazines	1
<i>as necessary.</i>	The (mass) media/all of these	1
	Other (Specify)	1
	Does not mean anything	1

*Note: If none of the first four above is circled say: "By press we mean TV, radio, newspapers, magazines, or any other system of reporting news."*

- 2 Would you say that the "press" is

Very honest in its reporting	1
Somewhat honest in its reporting	2
Not really honest in its reporting	3
Interested in developing interest	4

- 3a Which of the following do you believe most for international news? National news? Local news?

<i>Circle one only</i>	<i>TV</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>Newspapers</i>	<i>Magazines</i>
International news . .	1	2	3	4
National news . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Local news (home town)	1	2	3	4

- 3b Why do you believe (*Name medium*) most for international news?

---



---

- 3c Why do you believe (*Name medium*) most for national news?

---



---

3d Why do you believe (*Name medium*) most for local news?

---

---

4 Which is the most important medium as far as you are concerned for providing you with each of the following?

<i>Circle one only</i>	<i>TV</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>Newspapers</i>	<i>Magazines</i>
International news . .	1	2	3	4
National news . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Local news . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Why? _____				

---

5a Which of the following media would you turn to in an emergency news crisis?

*Circle as many as necessary.*

Radio . . . . .	1
TV . . . . .	1
Newspapers . . . . .	1
Magazines . . . . .	1

5b Why would you turn to (*Name medium*) first in an emergency?

---

---

6 When you think of the media – radio, TV, newspapers, and magazines – which one do you think is

<i>Circle one only.</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>TV</i>	<i>Newspapers</i>	<i>Magazines</i>
Most factual . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Most influential . . . .	1	2	3	4
Most essential . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Most educational . . . .	1	2	3	4
Most difficult to acquire information from . .	1	2	3	4
Most open or frank in its presentation . . . .	1	2	3	4
The one that the family gets interested in most	1	2	3	4

Most private . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Most personal, that is get most personally involved with . . . . .	1	2	3	4

7a Do you use more than one medium every day to acquire information?

Yes 1 No 2

*If no, go to 7d*

7b Which ones do you use?

*Circle as many as are necessary.*

Radio . . . . .	1
TV . . . . .	2
Newspapers . . . . .	3
Magazines . . . . .	4

7c Why do you use more than one to get information? \_\_\_\_\_

7d Which one do you use?

*Circle one only*

Radio . . . . .	1
TV . . . . .	2
Newspapers . . . . .	3
Magazines . . . . .	4

8a Do you believe that the press in Canada has the power to publish what it wishes without any government influence?

Yes 1 No 2

*If no,*

8b Do you feel the government should have this influence over the press?

Yes 1 No 2

9 Which of the following, if any, causes the press to bias their reporting?

	Yes	No
Federal Government . . . . .	1	2
Local Government . . . . .	1	2
Local police . . . . .	1	2
Federal police . . . . .	1	2



Big business .....	1	2
Criminal elements (Mafia) .....	1	2

10 Do you believe that the Mafia (Crime) has any influence in the press?

Yes      1                      No      2

If yes,

How does the Mafia influence the press? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

11 Would you say that you are better informed today than you were five years ago?

Yes      1                      No      2

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

12 Which of the following media is easiest to acquire information from?

In essence, which is effortless?

*Circle one only*

TV .....	1
Radio .....	2
Newspapers .....	3
Magazines .....	4

13 Which medium requires the most amount of energy and concentration from you?

*Circle one only*

TV .....	1
Radio .....	2
Newspapers .....	3
Magazines .....	4

14 I want you to think of TV. What do you like about it?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

What do you dislike about it? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

15 Now think of radio.

What do you like about it? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What do you dislike about it? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16 Think of newspapers.

What do you like about them? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

What do you dislike about them? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17 Are there any Canadian magazines that you read regularly?

Which ones? \_\_\_\_\_

Which is your favourite and why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

18a One of the responsibilities of the press is to report to us on what is happening in government and to those whom we have elected. Would you say that the reports concerning Mr. Trudeau have been

Very fair . . . . .	1
Somewhat fair . . . . .	2
Not at all fair . . . . .	3
Other (Specify) . . . . .	4



20a Do you think the press has invaded Mr. Stanfield's private life?

Yes 1

No 2

20b Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

20c Which medium do you think has been most unfair to Mr. Stanfield with respect to the invasion of his privacy?

*Circle one only*

Newspapers ..... 1

TV	2
----	---

Radio	3
-------	---

Magazines	4
-----------	---

21a Which medium, if any, would you fear most with respect to the invasion of your privacy?

*Circle one only*

Newspapers . . . . . 1

Radio .....

TV .....	3
----------	---

Magazines	4
-----------	---

Would fear none	5
-----------------	---

Why would you fear (*Name medium*) most?

21c If 5 above, ask

Why do you feel no need to fear the media in this regard?

22a Do you feel the media have the ability to affect people's thinking or way of life?

Yes 1

No 2

If yes, ask

22b Which medium is the most powerful in terms of affecting people's thinking or way of life?

*Circle one only*

Newspapers ..... 1

Radio	1
2	2

TV	2
	3

Magazines	4
-----------	---

22c Why?\_\_\_\_\_

23 Which of the following would you be most reluctant to lose for a week? A month? A year?

	Week	Month	Year
Radio . . . . .	1	1	1
TV . . . . .	2	2	2
Newspapers . . . . .	3	3	3

24 Tell me if you have been extremely well informed, somewhat informed, inadequately informed, or poorly informed about each of the following.

	Well informed	Somewhat informed	Inadequately informed	Poorly informed
Language bill . . . .	1	2	3	4
Stafford Smythe case . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Arab-Israeli conflict .	1	2	3	4
B.C. election . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Separatism . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Homosexual bill ..	1	2	3	4
National Medicare Scheme . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Moon Landing . . . .	1	2	3	4

25 Should the government depend on the media to inform you, or should they take steps to inform you independently of what the media do?

Rely totally on media . . . . .	1
Inform independent of media . . . . .	2

Why?\_\_\_\_\_

26 Would you say that the newspapers you read are

Practical in their reporting . . . . .	1
Impractical in their reporting . . . . .	2

27 Which of the following is most true?

<i>Circle one only.</i>	
The newspaper you read represents the interests of its advertisers, that is, big business. . . . .	1

The newspaper you read represents the interest of the public at large . . . 2

The newspaper you read represents the interests of the government in power . . . . . 3

- 28 Would you say the coverage of the politicians in our society has been
- Very biased . . . . . 1
- Somewhat biased . . . . . 2
- Not biased . . . . . 3

Explain \_\_\_\_\_

- 29 Which of the media do you think has been the most biased in favour of the ideas of government? Against the ideas of government

	In favour	Against
TV . . . . .	1	1
Radio . . . . .	2	2
Newspapers . . . . .	3	3

- 30 Think of the media – TV, newspapers, and radio. Do you believe they have had any influence on each of the following?

	<i>TV</i>		<i>Newspapers</i>		<i>Radio</i>	
	Some	No	Some	No	Some	No
increase in drug addiction	1	2	1	2	1	2
Smoking by young people	1	2	1	2	1	2
Divorce . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
Promiscuity . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
Alcoholism . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
increase in desire for						
education . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
Student protests . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
Labour's poor image . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
Canadian nationalism . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2

- 31 Again think of the three media. Have they included too much of the following in each of them in their content?

	<i>TV</i>		<i>Newspapers</i>		<i>Radio</i>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Violence . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
Sex . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2
Drug usage . . . . .	1	2	1	2	1	2

- 32a Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, or disagree with each of the following statements about newspapers.



	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree
Newspapers have too much sex in them . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers have too much about drugs in them . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers tend to be concerned about social problems . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers have too much violence in them . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers contribute to moral breakdown . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers contribute to a growing disrespect for religion . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers contribute to a growing feeling that Canada will break apart . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers contribute to a strong family relationship .	1	2	3
Newspapers contribute to a feeling that divorce is acceptable . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers are society's conscience . . . . .	1	2	3
Newspapers remind people of their responsibilities to less fortunate individuals .	1	2	3

32b Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, or disagree with each of the following statements about television.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree
Television has too much sex on it . . . . .	1	2	3
Television tends to be concerned about social problems . . . . .	1	2	3
Television has too much about drugs on it . . . . .	1	2	3
Television has too much violence on it . . . . .	1	2	3
Television contributes to moral breakdown . . . . .	1	2	3

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree
Television contributes to a growing disrespect for religion . . . . .	1	2	3
Television contributes to a growing feeling that Canada will break apart .	1	2	3
Television contributes to a strong family relationship. . . . .	1	2	3
Television contributes to a feeling that divorce is acceptable . . . . .	1	2	3
Television is society's conscience . . . . .	1	2	3
Television reminds people of their responsibilities to less fortunate individuals . .	1	2	3

32c Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, or disagree with each of the following statements about radio

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree
Radio has too much sex on it . . . . .	1	2	3
Radio tends to be concerned about social problems . . .	1	2	3
Radio has too much about drugs on it . . . . .	1	2	3
Radio has too much violence on it . . . . .	1	2	3
Radio contributes to moral breakdown . . . . .	1	2	3
Radio contributes to a growing disrespect for religion . . . . .	1	2	3
Radio contributes to a strong family relationship .	1	2	3
Radio contributes to a growing feeling that Canada will break apart . . . . .	1	2	3
Radio is society's conscience	1	2	3
Radio reminds people of their responsibilities to less fortunate individuals . .	1	2	3

32d Please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, or disagree with each of the following statements about magazines.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree
Magazines have too much sex in them . . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines tend to be concerned about social problems . . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines have too much about drugs in them . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines have too much violence in them . . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines contribute to moral breakdown . . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines contribute to a growing disrespect for religion . . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines contribute to a strong family relationship	1	2	3
Magazines contribute to a growing feeling that Canada will break apart	1	2	3
Magazines contribute to a feeling that divorce is acceptable . . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines are society's conscience . . . . .	1	2	3
Magazines remind people of their responsibilities to less fortunate individuals	1	2	3

33 Are newspapers for people who are

- Highly intelligent . . . . . 1
- Fairly intelligent . . . . . 2
- For everybody . . . . . 3

Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

34 Is radio for people who are

- Highly intelligent . . . . . 1
- Fairly intelligent . . . . . 2
- For everybody . . . . . 3

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

35a When you hear news in any of the media, which news do you trust the most?

International news	1
National news	2
Local news	3

35b Which are you most interested in?

International	1
National	2
Local	3

35c Why? \_\_\_\_\_

36a Which would you rather see?

More international news	1
More national news	2
More local news	3

36b Do you think there is a good balance of these three?

Yes      1                      No      2

37 Do you think the real news gets into the press, or is the news in the press controlled?

Real news	1
Controlled	2

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

38 Think of a newspaper. About how much time each day do you spend reading

Front page	minutes
Financial section	minutes
Editorials	minutes
International news	minutes
Women's section	minutes
Want ads	minutes
Sports	minutes
Travel	minutes
Other (Specify)	minutes

39 Would you prefer

More editorial comment .....	1
The same amount of editorial comment .....	2
Less editorial comment .....	3

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

40a Do you get a news magazine?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

40b If yes, which one?

Time .....	1
Newsweek .....	2
Other (Specify) .....	3

41 Which of the four media (*Name them*) do you turn to for

	<i>TV</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>Newspaper</i>	<i>Magazine</i>
Facts .....	1	1	1	1
Special report .....	1	1	1	1
Background .....	1	1	1	1
Interpretation .....	1	1	1	1
Entertainment .....	1	1	1	1
Relaxation .....	1	1	1	1

42 Do you watch news on TV

daily .....	1
three times a week .....	2
once a week .....	3
other (specify) .....	4

43 Which network do you watch the news on?

American network (ABC, CBS, NBC) .....	1
CBC .....	2
CTV .....	3

44 Who is your favourite newsmen?

\_\_\_\_\_

45a Can a TV camera lie?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

45b If yes, does this frighten or bother you?

Yes      1                      No      2

46 Think of the three media — television, radio, and newspapers. Which one is

*Circle one only*

	<i>TV</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>Newspaper</i>
The most immediate .....	1	2	3
The most exciting .....	1	2	3
The most personal .....	1	2	3
The most private .....	1	2	3
The most influential .....	1	2	3

47a Do you have any children under 10 years of age?

Yes      1                      No      2

47b If yes, how much television do they watch in a week?

1 hour or less .....	1
2 — 5 hours .....	2
6 — 10 hours .....	3
11 — 15 hours .....	4
16 — 20 hours .....	5
21 — 30 hours .....	6
over 30 hours .....	7

47c Do you discourage your children from watching TV?

Yes      1                      No      2

47d In your opinion, which do you think is the best place for your child to acquire information?

*Circle one only*

TV .....	1
Radio .....	2
Newspaper .....	3

Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

48a I want you to tell me whether you think these things should be shown on TV or not.

	Yes	No
Cartoons which show people throwing pies at each other .....	1	2



War stories . . . . .	1	2
Fights in a hockey game . . . . .	1	2
Players disobeying the referee . . . . .	1	2
A mother and father having a fight . . . . .	1	2
A boy fighting with a policeman . . . . .	1	2
Somebody sniffing glue . . . . .	1	2
Students rioting . . . . .	1	2
A man and a woman making love . . . . .	1	2
Nudity . . . . .	1	2
A man throwing a pie in someone's face . . . . .	1	2
A live assassination . . . . .	1	2
An actual funeral . . . . .	1	2

48b Are any of these things contributing to, or would they contribute to a break-down of morality if they were shown on TV?

	Yes	No
Cartoons which show people throwing pies at each other . . . . .	1	2
War stories . . . . .	1	2
Fights in a hockey game . . . . .	1	2
Players disobeying the referee . . . . .	1	2
A mother and father having a fight . . . . .	1	2
A boy fighting with a policeman . . . . .	1	2
Somebody sniffing glue . . . . .	1	2
Students rioting . . . . .	1	2
A man and a woman making love . . . . .	1	2
Nudity . . . . .	1	2
A man throwing a pie in someone's face . . . . .	1	2
A live assassination . . . . .	1	2
An actual funeral . . . . .	1	2

49a Do you ever talk to your radio or television?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

49b If yes, which one?

Radio . . . . .	1
Television . . . . .	2

49c What makes you do it? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

50 Do you think that the advertiser controls the content of the news?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

51 Do you think you are influenced by advertising?

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| A great deal | 1 |
| Somewhat     | 2 |
| A little     | 3 |
| Not at all   | 4 |
| I fight it   | 5 |

52 When do you think advertising influences you most?

*Circle one only*

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| TV        | 1 |
| Radio     | 2 |
| Newspaper | 3 |

53 Is there a positive role for advertising?

Yes      1                      No      2

Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Anything else \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

54 Is advertising a form of art?

Yes      1                      No      2

Try to explain your choice \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

55 Which type of ads do you like best?

*Circle one only*

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Ones with facts only | 1 |
| Ones with humour     | 2 |
| Ones with suspense   | 3 |
| Other (Specify)      | 4 |

56 Do you ever find the ads on TV of more interest than the programme?

Yes      1                      No      2

57 When you think of newspaper advertising, do you consider some of it to be news?

Yes      1                      No      2

Please explain \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

58 What is the worst thing an ad can do to you? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

59 Do you think the number of ads in a movie on TV should be controlled?

Yes      1                      No      2

Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

60 Which is most likely to influence your purchasing decision?

An ad that you like and remember . . . . .	1
An ad you dislike and remember . . . . .	2
Both equally . . . . .	3

61 Do you think TV advertising is more effective in inducing people to smoke than newspaper or radio advertising?

Yes      1                      No      2

If yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

62 Should such things as the following be banned from advertising?

	Yes	No
Cigarettes . . . . .	1	2
Liquor . . . . .	1	2
Sleeping pills . . . . .	1	2
Gasoline . . . . .	1	2
Glue . . . . .	1	2
Pop . . . . .	1	2
Beer . . . . .	1	2
Wine . . . . .	1	2

63 Which do you prefer to read about

Violence .....	1
Love .....	2

Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

64 Do you get satisfaction in seeing some violence, for example, a hockey player punching another, or a fight between two cowboys?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

Please explain \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

65 I would like you to rate each of TV, radio, and newspapers as being acceptable for each of the following kinds of people. We will use a rating scale of 1 to 5. A rating of 1 means you don't think the medium is good for them, a rating of 5 means you think the medium is very good for them. Other numbers represent the positions between. Let's try TV for young people. How would you rate it?

	<i>TV</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>Newspaper</i>
Young people .....	_____	_____	_____
Middle-aged people .....	_____	_____	_____
Older people .....	_____	_____	_____
Business people .....	_____	_____	_____
Working people .....	_____	_____	_____
Housewives .....	_____	_____	_____
Children under 10 .....	_____	_____	_____

66 Do you ever get really excited about a TV programme?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

If yes, try to remember the last one and tell me why \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

67a Would it matter to you if Canadian newspapers were owned by foreigners?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

67b Which foreign owners would be most palatable or acceptable?

US .....	1
Britain .....	2
France .....	3
Other (Specify) .....	4

68a Would it matter to you if Canadian radio stations were owned by foreigners?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

68b Which foreign owners would be most palatable or acceptable?

US .....	1
Britain .....	2
France .....	3
Other (Specify) .....	4

69a Would it matter to you if Canadian television stations were owned by foreigners?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

69b Which foreign owners would be most palatable or acceptable?

US .....	1
Britain .....	2
France .....	3
Other (Specify) .....	4

70 Tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with each of the following statements.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
One person or company should be allowed to own the TV station, radio station and newspaper in a local area .....	1	2	3	4
One company should be allowed to own most of the newspapers in one area .....	1	2	3	4

One company should be allowed to own newspapers in more than one city, i.e. in all parts of the country	1	2	3	4
One company should be allowed to own TV stations in all parts of the country . . . . .	1	2	3	4
One company should be allowed to own radio stations in all parts of the country . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Broadcast stations should be owned by local citizens. There should not be absentee owners. . . .	1	2	3	4
Companies or individuals should not be restricted from controlling more than one medium in any one area . . . . .	1	2	3	4
No company should be allowed to have controlling interest of companies in more than one medium . . . . .	1	2	3	4

71 Tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree
I want the news to be simple and factual . . . . .	1	2	3
I want to acquire information with the least possible effort . . . .	1	2	3
I do not want the news to be sophisticated. It should be easy to understand . . . . .	1	2	3
I like stories that are happy . . . .	1	2	3
I like stories that have all the gory details, e.g. accidents or war stories . . . . .	1	2	3



72 Think of the Canadian news you read, see, or hear about. Would you say that it is generally

Pessimistic . . . . .	1
Optimistic . . . . .	2
Neither . . . . .	3

73 Are you getting enough information or background in the following areas from the media? Tell me which one does the best job.

	Yes	No	TV	Radio	Newspaper
Consumer goods . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3
Changes in law . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3
Consumer places to shop . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3
Taxes . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3
Canadian economics . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3
Canadian labour . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3
Canadian politics . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3
National unity . . . . .	1	2	1	2	3

74 I am going to read you a list of things. Which one medium — of TV, radio, or newspapers — do you think has the greatest influence on your attitudes toward or your habits in relation to each of them.

<i>Circle one medium only</i>	TV	Radio	Newspapers
Money . . . . .	1	2	3
Travel . . . . .	1	2	3
Security . . . . .	1	2	3
Law . . . . .	1	2	3
Courts . . . . .	1	2	3
Economic system . . . . .	1	2	3
School system . . . . .	1	2	3
Sex . . . . .	1	2	3
Love . . . . .	1	2	3
Marriage . . . . .	1	2	3
Family . . . . .	1	2	3
Religion . . . . .	1	2	3
Birth control . . . . .	1	2	3
Divorce . . . . .	1	2	3
Canadian nationalism . . . . .	1	2	3
Political fever . . . . .	1	2	3
Clothes - fads . . . . .	1	2	3
Clothes - styles . . . . .	1	2	3
Student movement . . . . .	1	2	3
Personal habits . . . . .	1	2	3
Strikes . . . . .	1	2	3
Profanity . . . . .	1	2	3



31 – 45 minutes . . . . .	3
46 – 60 minutes . . . . .	4
More than an hour . . . . .	5

79 How much television do you watch in a week?

One hour or less . . . . .	1
2 – 5 hours . . . . .	2
6 – 10 hours . . . . .	3
11 – 15 hours . . . . .	4
16 – 20 hours . . . . .	5
21 – 30 hours . . . . .	6
over 30 hours . . . . .	7

80 Which of the three media – TV, radio, and newspapers – is most sensational?

*Circle one only*

TV . . . . .	1
Radio . . . . .	2
Newspapers . . . . .	3

81 Which of the following do you prefer on TV?

*Circle one.*

Canadian shows . . . . .	1
American shows . . . . .	2

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

82 Which do you prefer, Canadian or American (*Name medium*)?

*Circle one*

	Canadian	American
TV . . . . .	1	2
Radio . . . . .	1	2
Newspapers . . . . .	1	2
Magazines . . . . .	1	2

83 Do you think the media invade people's privacy?

Yes      1                      No      2

84 Which does it most?

*Circle one*

TV . . . . .	1
Radio . . . . .	2
Newspaper . . . . .	3

85 Should four-letter words be allowed in

	Yes	No
Newspapers . . . . .	1	2
Magazines . . . . .	1	2
Television . . . . .	1	2
Radio . . . . .	1	2

86 Do the media in Canada tend to

Create friendship with the US	1
Create enmity or bad feelings	2

87 Do the media in Canada tend to

Create understanding of French-Canadian desires	1
Create resentment toward French-Canadian desires	2

88 Do you feel that the media have too much freedom?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

Explain \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

89 Which of the following acts most as an “ombudsman” or public protector?

<i>Circle one</i>	
TV . . . . .	1
Radio . . . . .	2
Newspapers . . . . .	3

90 Should the media criticize each other?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

91 Do you want

More news daily . . . . .	1
The same amount as now . . . . .	2
Less news daily . . . . .	3

92 Which of the following do you think is *most* critical of government actions?

<i>Circle one</i>	
TV . . . . .	1
Radio . . . . .	2
Newspapers . . . . .	3

93 Are the media

Too critical of government . . . . .	1
Doing a good job . . . . .	2
Not critical enough . . . . .	3

94a Tell me whether you watch, listen to, or read each of the following very regularly, sometimes, rarely, or never.

	Very Regularly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
“Dear Abby” . . . . .	1	2	3	4
“Playboy Advisor”. . . . .	1	2	3	4
Horoscopes . . . . .	1	2	3	4
Telephone radio pro- grammes in which people ask questions of an announcer	1	2	3	4
TV panel shows. . . . .	1	2	3	4

94b What do you like about these programmes?  
Indicate which respondent is talking about

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

94c What do you dislike about them?  
Indicate which respondent is talking about

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

95 Do you know who owns the local TV station or stations?

Yes      1                      No      2

Who? \_\_\_\_\_

96 Do you know who owns the local newspaper(s)?

Yes      1                      No      2

Who? \_\_\_\_\_

97 Do you know who owns the local radio station(s)?

Yes      1                      No      2

Who? \_\_\_\_\_

98a Are you interested or does the ownership of the local TV station(s) matter?

Interested . . . . . 1  
Doesn't matter . . . . . 2

98b What about the newspaper(s)?

Interested . . . . . 1  
Doesn't matter . . . . . 2

98c And the radio station(s)?

Interested . . . . . 1  
Doesn't matter . . . . . 2

99 Do you know the political affiliation or position of the local

	Yes	No
TV Station(s) . . . . .	1	2
Newspaper(s) . . . . .	1	2
Radio station(s) . . . . .	1	2

100 Do they influence your political positions at all?

	Yes	No
Newspaper(s) . . . . .	1	2
Radio station(s) . . . . .	1	2
TV station(s) . . . . .	1	2

101 What is your favourite newspaper?

\_\_\_\_\_

102 What is the most influential newspaper in your area?

\_\_\_\_\_

103 Is there such a thing as a national newspaper in Canada?

Yes      1                      No      2

What is it? \_\_\_\_\_



104 Do you have any opinion as to what the best newspaper in Canada is?

\_\_\_\_\_

105 Do you have any favourite . . .

telecasters \_\_\_\_\_

radio announcers \_\_\_\_\_

newspaper columnists \_\_\_\_\_

106 In respect to Canadian control in the (*Name medium*) is there

	<i>Newspaper</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>TV</i>
Too much . . . . .	1	1	1
Just enough . . . . .	2	2	2
Too little . . . . .	3	3	3

107 The press (that is, newspapers) supervise themselves in Canada. Should the government cease to supervise TV? Radio?

TV	Yes	1	No	2
----	-----	---	----	---

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

Radio	Yes	1	No	2
-------	-----	---	----	---

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

107b Should the government also control the newspapers?

Yes	1	No	2
-----	---	----	---

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

108 When you think of the police, would you say that (*Name medium*) has been

	<i>TV</i>	<i>Radio</i>	<i>Newspaper</i>
Very fair to their image . . . .	1	1	1
Just fair to their image . . . .	2	2	2
Not fair to their image . . . .	3	3	3

## BASIC DATA

A. How many newspapers do you receive daily?

None . . . . .	1
One . . . . .	2
Two . . . . .	3
Three or more . . . . .	4

B. How many radios do you have in your home?

None .....	1
One .....	2
Two .....	3
Three .....	4
Four or more .....	5

C. How many television sets do you have in your home?

None .....	1
One .....	2
Two .....	3
Three or more .....	4

D. Are you on cable television?

Yes      1                      No      2

E. In which of the following education categories do you belong?

Elementary school .....	1
Some high school .....	2
Completed high school .....	3
Some college .....	4
Completed college .....	5
Graduate school .....	6

F. In which of the following age categories do you belong?

under 20 .....	1
20 - 24 .....	2
25 - 34 .....	3
35 - 44 .....	4
45 - 54 .....	5
55 and over .....	6

G. What is the population of the community you live in?

Less than 5,000 .....	1
5,000 - 20,000 .....	2
20,000 - 50,000 .....	3
50,000 - 100,000 .....	4
100,000 - 500,000 .....	5
over 500,000 .....	6

H. In which of the following categories would your family income fall?

under \$4,000 .....	1
4,000 - 6,000 .....	2

6,001 – 8,000 .....	3
8,001 – 10,000.....	4
10,001 – 12,000 .....	5
over 12,000 .....	6

I. Sex:

Male .....	1
Female.....	2

J.

Farmer .....	1
Non-farmer .....	2

K. City/Town \_\_\_\_\_

L. Province \_\_\_\_\_

INTERVIEWER \_\_\_\_\_

RESPONDENT'S NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

DATE COMPLETED \_\_\_\_\_

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

VERIFIED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX 2

## Statistical Tolerances

Probability Level — 19 times out of 20  
Range of Error is Plus or Minus:

		Where percentage shown is:																	
		1% or 99%	2% or 98%	3% or 97%	4% or 96%	5% or 95%	6% or 94%	8% or 92%	10% or 90%	12% or 88%	15% or 85%	20% or 80%	25% or 75%	30% or 70%	35% or 65%	40% or 60%	45% or 55%	50%	
100	.....	—	—	—	3.9	4.4	4.8	5.4	6.0	6.5	7.2	8.0	8.7	9.2	9.6	9.8	9.9	10.0	
200	.....	—	—	2.4	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.8	4.3	4.6	5.1	5.7	6.1	6.5	6.3	7.0	7.0	7.1	
250	.....	—	1.8	2.2	2.5	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.8	4.1	4.5	5.0	5.5	5.8	6.0	6.2	6.2	6.3	
300	.....	—	1.6	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.8	4.1	4.6	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.7	5.8	5.8	
400	.....	1.0	1.4	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.6	4.0	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	
500	.....	0.9	1.3	1.5	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.7	2.9	3.2	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.5	
600	.....	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	
800	.....	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.5	
1,000	.....	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.2	
2,000	.....	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	

## Part II

### SELECTED PRINT MEDIA





## Chapter 1

### CANADIAN NEWSPAPER PRACTICE

*Borden Spears*

#### INTRODUCTION

There are in Canada — if one counts morning and evening editions as separate publications — 116 daily newspapers. Their total circulation at the end of 1969 was 4,781,000.

These newspapers are as various as the constituencies they serve. They differ widely in physical size, in resources of staff and equipment, in format, in typography and layout. They differ in editorial approach and quality, in political persuasion, in the personal biases of the people who own them, direct them, write them, and edit them. They bear the stamp of regional disparity: quite aside from local content, a prairie newspaper is distinguishable from a paper published on the Atlantic coast, and to read the Vancouver *Sun* is a different experience from reading the Montreal *Gazette*. Some are locally owned and independent of outside control; others are members of national and even international chains. But even the chain-owned newspapers are conditioned by the communities in which they exist, whether industrial or agricultural, metropolitan or small-town.

It is tempting, but footless, to attempt to assign to the newspapers a value rating in the communications scale — to debate, for example, whether they have more influence than television on the opinions and conduct of Canadians. That way lies McLuhanism and muddle. Even the advertising priesthood, with the arcane instruments of motivational research and audience analysis, have no reliable formula for this kind of measurement.

Depth of penetration, then, defies determination; but coverage can be measured. And fourteen million Canadians read newspapers every day. To the ordinary citizen, his newspaper is the primary source of information about the world at large and about the particular influences — natural, political, and social — that bear upon his life. For the newspaper is unique in this respect, that its content is for the most part dictated to it by outside events which it does not control. The magazine editor or the television producer enjoys the luxury of choice; he can deal with the subjects that interest him, or that he thinks will interest his audience. The newspaper editor, by the terms of his charter, must try to keep a watch on all the world's happenings and report them, as rapidly and intelligibly as possible, to the public. No other

medium, commonly available and accessible for reference, equals the newspaper in the volume of relevant data that it records day by day.

It follows that the influence of the newspapers is enormous — not because of the packaged opinions of the editorial page in which editors and publishers tell the people what to think, but because they are reporting to their readers what the world is like; by selection and presentation are passing on their own view of it. If the editor is a cynic or a fool, he will by unconscious degrees tend to influence his readers in the direction of cynicism or foolishness. Though the newspapers are currently suffering from a credibility gap (for reasons which will be touched on in this paper), they are still believed. The printed word carries a mysterious authority; what we read is true. "All I know," said Will Rogers, "is what I read in the papers." He spoke for most of us.

Given all this, it hardly needs to be said that in a democratic society a heavy burden of responsibility rests upon the newspaperman, on the man who gathers and writes the news and the man who prepares it for publication. The newspaperman has a duty to be fair if not impartial, to be accurate, and to be complete. He must be in addition intelligent, knowledgeable, and professionally competent. It is the purpose of this paper to examine the Canadian newspaper scene in terms of methods, human equipment, and practice, and to provide some basis for assessment of the performance of our daily press.

This examination is made easier by the fact that despite the diversities mentioned earlier, there is among Canadian newspapers a basic uniformity of tone and purpose. We have no gutter press. There is no sharp dividing line such as the one that exists in Britain between the quality press, as represented by the *Times* and the *Guardian*, and the sensational press typified by the *News of the World*. Canada's newspapers, by and large, aspire to quality; where they differ is in performance. If there is a distinction to be made in this respect, it lies in the extent to which commercial considerations affect editorial excellence. A newspaper is a business; it must pay or perish. The desire to make money and the desire to produce a good newspaper are not mutually exclusive; but some publishers are unable, and some are unwilling, to give excellence an equal priority with profit.

## MODEL NEWSPAPER

Since limitations of space preclude individual examination of the more than 100 newspapers in this country, it will be convenient and useful to construct an imaginary but representative model that combines the features of structure and organization that are common to all. This is necessary because of the wide disparity in size, manpower, and resources between Canadian papers. The basic units in any newspaper operation are a reporter, an editor, and a printing press. But consider the editorial establishment of the *Toronto Star*: an editor-in-chief, a managing editor, an executive editor, two assistant managing editors, four senior editors, a news editor, a city editor, seven assistant city editors, a features editor, a chief copy editor, a sports editor, a financial editor, a foreign news editor, a national editor, a women's editor, a travel editor, a production editor, four make-up editors, an art director, three photo editors, fifteen copy editors, and more than

100 assistant departmental editors, general reporters, political reporters, foreign correspondents, columnists, reviewers, and special writers in such fields as business, sports, labour, education, real estate, religion, medicine, science, gardening, and the arts. The total editorial staff: 256. Only twenty miles away, but at the other end of the manpower spectrum, the Oakville *Journal-Record* is produced daily by a staff of eighteen — seven editors and eleven reporters.

## SIZE, RESOURCES, AND FACILITIES

Clearly, our composite newspaper lies somewhere between these extremes. In size, resources and facilities, it approximates the Regina *Leader-Post* or the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record*. It is published in a city of 100,000 people and is the “home” newspaper in six to ten surrounding counties. Its circulation is 50,000, which means that it has 150,000 readers. This is “saturation” coverage of the community. It is an afternoon paper with two editions. The early edition contains a number of “district” pages and is trucked to the rural communities. The second edition contains more city news, later stock market quotations, and more complete sports results. The paper has a staff of fifty editors, reporters and photographers, plus a network of part-time area correspondents who are paid space rates for sending in notes of local doings. It sends a staff reporter to the provincial capital during the session of the legislature but does not have its own man in Ottawa. If it is a member of a chain, it is covered by the chain’s Ottawa bureau; otherwise, it shares with a number of other newspapers the “special” reports of an Ottawa press gallery free-lance. It is served by the Canadian Press wire service, which includes American and world news selected by C.P. from the Associated Press, Agence France-Presse, and Reuters agencies. In addition, it buys — for \$100 to \$200 a week — a teletyped service from another American syndicate, most probably the Chicago *Daily News* or the Washington *Post-Los Angeles Times* service. For its Saturday feature pages, it may also buy mailed features from a syndicate like North American Newspaper Alliance, or the syndicate operated by the Toronto *Telegram*. It also buys syndicated cartoons for the editorial and sports pages.

The paper is a faithful mirror of its middle-class community. It does not rock any boats. The publisher serves on the hospital board and plays golf with other business leaders of the city. The editor gives generous publicity support to the Community Chest and other fund drives. The paper conscientiously reports city council meetings, school board decisions, traffic accidents, and industrial strikes. It covers local scandals when they break into public view, but it does not dig for them, and it reports them with restraint. It enjoys a friendly relationship with the police; the police chief makes no objection to the fact that a radio in the newsroom monitors all police calls. The city has no sizeable hippie community, but there is a motorcycle gang of more than local notoriety. The paper reports their appearances in court for gang fights or multiple rape, but it has never published an article examining the cyclists as a social phenomenon.

It is a competent newspaper, not an exciting one. The editor is proud of it: “This paper goes into the homes. We don’t publish anything you would not want to



see in your home.” To the publisher, his circulation figures demonstrate that the public likes the paper as it is. What if there were a competing newspaper in town? The question does not arise. To start a second paper would require a large amount of capital, assurance of advertising support, and a C.P. franchise for which one of the criteria is other publishers’ estimate of economic viability. None of these is in prospect.

## STAFF STRUCTURE

How is the newspaper staffed? Who makes the decisions, and how are they carried out? What follows is a capsule description of titles and functions. In detail it will vary from paper to paper, but the basic structure is virtually identical in every Canadian newsroom.

### *The Editor.*

Technically he is responsible for the total news and editorial operation, but in practice he confines his day-by-day attention to the editorial page. He started as a junior reporter, has spent thirty-two years with the paper, and has absorbed the publisher’s philosophy so thoroughly that he rarely needs to ask for guidance on matters of policy. He writes at least one editorial a day, keeps an avuncular but distant eye on the news side, represents the paper at public functions, and keeps in close personal touch with politicians and community leaders. He is at his best when writing editorials on community affairs and local issues, weakest on questions of economics and national policy. He is wistfully aware that there is a generation gap.

### *Managing Editor.*

Except for the editorial page, he is the final arbiter of what the public will read. He hires and fires, appoints and supervises department editors, negotiates with the advertising manager for space. He does not sit at the news desk but keeps himself free to prod, suggest, trouble-shoot, and handle administration. He is automatically consulted about important stories.

### *News Editor.*

Top man on the news desk. In the absence of the managing editor, he will put out the paper. He is the one man who reads everything; stories from all department editors (except, possibly, sports) funnel through him, and he determines their relative importance and position in the paper. If a story does not satisfy him, he sends it back for revision. He orders and approves all headlines, personally draws up a dummy of the front page, and either dummies or directs the make-up of all other pages.

### *City Editor.*

In charge of all local reporters and suburban area correspondents, and hence the busiest man in the office. He appoints reporters to beats or special assignments,

directs their efforts, is responsible for training and development. He must have an intimate knowledge of his city — its history, its politics, its interlocking social relationships — and of the people who make it tick. He profiles the city every day, and he never has enough time, enough staff, or enough space to do it as well as he could.

#### *Telegraph Editor.*

He handles the news from the province, the rest of Canada, and the United States (but not from Washington or the United Nations; these go to the cable editor). His material is the copy which pours in by teletype, twenty-four hours a day, from C.P., A.P., Reuters, U.P., and probably at least one other wire service. His job is selection and condensation; when astronauts go to the moon, he is inundated by a flood of constantly changing and overlapping reports and special features, from a dozen sources, which must be instantly assimilated and knitted together into a coherent and up-to-the-minute account.

#### *Cable Editor.*

His beat is the rest of the world; his material, again, is the wire-service flimsy. On some papers the cable editor is responsible for Ottawa news; on others it is handled by the telegraph editor, in some cases by the city editor.

#### *Sports Editor, Financial Editor, Women's Editor.*

These are self-explanatory.

#### *Chief Copy Editor.*

Known in the trade as the "slot man." As with the news editor, everything funnels through him. When the news editor has accepted a story, he hands it to the slot man for final detailed editing. The slot man farms it out to one of a battery of copy editors whose job is to polish the style, check it for accuracy or possible libel, and write a heading. When the heading is approved by the news editor, it goes to the composing room for setting into type.

(A complication arises here which deserves attention. Of the 103 newspapers which are members of Canadian Press, seventy depend on C.P. for *all* their non-staff-written news, and seventy-nine receive the C.P. file by teletypesetter. This in a relatively modern installation by which the news, punched on a machine in C.P.'s Toronto newsroom, is transmitted directly to linotype machines in the mechanical departments of the member newspapers. This is an important economy; it means that the newspaper needs no linotype operator to set the C.P. news. But it also means that a C.P. editor in Toronto is producing stories which will appear identically in seventy-nine newspapers across the country. The C.P. editor is competent; but no two editors would handle a story in the same way, and the local editor has lost his opportunity to edit the story in his own way. It is true that the local editor receives a duplicate of the story on tape, and can pencil in changes to be set manually by a human operator; but, to the extent that he does this, he defeats the purpose of the teletypesetter. The tendency is to leave the C.P. story alone, or to confine local

editing to the slicing out of individual paragraphs with a scissors. The effect is a grey uniformity.)

### *Reporters*

In the end, everything depends on them. No matter how good the editor, he is ultimately at the mercy of the man he sends to do the story. If the reporter misquotes or distorts or misrepresents or betrays a confidence, the editor has no way of knowing it until the story has been published and the storm has burst. He can then, of course, fire the man. More common, and more difficult to deal with, is simple incompetence: the reporter skimps his research, muddles the facts, or misses the vital point in a complex situation. It may take months or years before the truth sinks in that the trouble is not inexperience but inadequacy.

## JOURNALISM AS A PROFESSION

How good are Canadian reporters? Good, but not as good as they could be. They lack, to begin with, the professional and technical competence of their counterparts in the United States and Britain. This is partly because their training is inferior and partly because neither the newspaper industry nor the members of the craft collectively are working to improve standards. In Britain, for example, the industry-supported Press Council works constantly and effectively to establish standards of newspaper performance and to police the product. The Institute of Journalists plays a similar role within the profession. In Canada there are no press councils. Nor is there another industry watchdog. The governors of the Canadian Press, who might fill the function, occupy their annual meetings with matters of finance, logistics, and technological improvement. At the level of the working newsman, the only considerable organization is the American Newspaper Guild; it is a trade union, concerned with pay and working conditions, relinquishing to employers the upgrading of professional standards.

There exist in Canada only two university departments of journalism, at Carleton University and the University of Western Ontario. They are staffed for the most part by men whose own background in journalism is not outstanding. They offer what are essentially liberal-arts courses, enriched by courses in the history of journalism, news and feature writing, newspaper ethics, and newsroom mechanics. They are useful courses, but they do not yet provide a first-class professional training ground. They grant forty or fifty degrees a year, but approximately half their graduates go not to newspapers but to public relations, to industrial publications, or to radio-TV. In the opinion of most editors, a Canadian degree in journalism still carries little, if any, advantage over a degree in English or history or economics.

It follows that newspapermen are trained on the job, like factory hands. An axiom of the business is that "what makes a good reporter is a good city editor." But a city editor who is functioning at his job has no time to be also a teacher. The system is well enough for apprentices on an assembly line, but it is far from adequate for an occupation which likes to regard itself as a profession.



With a few notable exceptions, no Canadian newspaper has a consistent training programme. It is true that many papers do take aspiring university students and put them to work during vacations, in the hope that they will return to full-time work upon graduation. But this is a recruiting scheme, not a training system; students and fledgling reporters are simply thrown into the mainstream, to sink or swim.

One of the notable exceptions is the *Toronto Star*, which in 1969 had eighteen students – selected from more than 300 applicants – in its summer training school. The students spend half their day at normal working assignments, turning their copy in to the desk like any other reporter, or working at the copy desk themselves. For the remainder of the day they are under the tutelage of an editor assigned as their “professor.” He analyses and grades their work individually, and sets up lectures and seminars with other senior editors, as well as “bull sessions” with visiting dignitaries such as Senator Davey and Premier Robarts.

Some other newspapers have student programmes approaching this one in organization and content. But the *Star* itself goes beyond it, with formal training programmes for permanent employees. Groups of reporters and editors, including those with long experience, are detached for stated periods and assigned to specific areas of study. Outside experts are imported. Under the guidance of a senior editor, the group learns about public administration from politicians and officials; about labour relations from union leaders and employers; about urban problems from city planners and social workers; about financial affairs from economists and businessmen. The object is to upgrade not only technical skills but also basic knowledge among people whose function is not only to report but to interpret, and who cannot interpret without understanding.

As the largest and richest newspaper in the country, the *Toronto Star* is able to afford the time and the manpower for an elaborate and continuous training programme on a scale that others cannot match. But few publishing operations are so poor that they could not devote some attention to so vital a requirement. Most of them do not.

There is another major factor operating against real excellence in the ranks of news and editorial workers. It is financial reward. Except for a few at the top of the heap, newspapermen are poorly paid by comparison with those in other professions of comparable public responsibility. In Toronto, the current scale for fully experienced reporters is \$190 a week; Toronto brick-layers last year signed a contract awarding them \$240 a week. The Peterborough *Examiner* was formerly respected as one of the country's quality newspapers, well written and well edited. At the time of last year's unsuccessful strike by editorial employees, the salary of its highest-paid reporter was \$120 a week, which is \$20 less than garbagemen are paid in Windsor, Ontario. Other reporters were in a range from \$70 to \$95 a week; the managing editor received slightly more than \$200 a week. These are not salaries to attract the ablest and most ambitious young people entering the professional world.

## A RENEWED COMMITMENT

Despite all this, it can be said that a new and better breed of journalist is indeed appearing on the scene. Traditionally the Canadian newspaperman is one who started as a copy boy, worked his way through occasional sports assignments to the police beat, to city hall, and eventually, perhaps, to the legislature and Parliament Hill. Along the way he acquired a workmanlike competence at assembling facts and setting them down in order. From this unlikely progression, through their own native talent and effort, some fine journalists emerged; but it was not a system to produce the sophisticated analysis required in the complex society of today.

### THE NEW JOURNALIST

Today's journalist is much more likely to be a university product, with formal training in history, logic, economics, and political science. Some newspapers now will not hire a man who has no degree. The new breed are confident, iconoclastic, and professional; they often feel that they know more than their tradition-en-crustured bosses. They have fire in their bellies; they are members of the committed generation, and they go into journalism because they are looking for careers with meaning and social responsibility. They are impatient for change, and their impatience exerts pressure on their employers. They see a social revolution in progress, and they believe the press should be participating in it, not resisting it, if the press is to retain its influence. Regardless of ideology (many of them are politically conservative), they tend to see the modern industrial state as an economic giant over which governments have lost control. They see governments floundering to react to change, rather than consciously directing it. And they see people confused by rapid change which is not understood. In this situation, the new journalists see the role of the press as one of prophecy and interpretation. They are less concerned with old-fashioned "hard" news — what happened where, who said what — than with "soft" news — putting events in context, explaining and giving meaning to the forces of change.

### THE NEW JOURNALISM

This is a serious view of press responsibility, and to anyone who compares the newspapers of a decade ago with those of today it will be evident that this view is gaining ground. It is the misfortune of the newspapers, however, that public recognition of this fact lags behind performance. It is easy, and fairly popular, to deride the daily press as cynical purveyors of the cheap, the flashy, and the sensational. These are certainly components of the daily newspaper diet — as they are components of the society which the press reflects. But there is solid evidence that the charge of cynical exploitation is unfair.

In the course of this study, a number of Canadian publishers were asked to define the function of the newspaper. Their replies were strikingly unanimous. The

job of the newspaper, they said, is first, to inform; second, to interpret; third, to entertain. It is of course possible to suspect that these are ritual answers; but the publishers can at least be given credit for studying their market. The rightness of their formula was statistically supported in an elaborate audience survey conducted several years ago in Toronto by the father of motivational research, Dr. Ernest Dichter.

The Dichter researchers first established that the reader's opinion of his newspaper is formed, as much as much as anything, by the contents and the format of its front page. They then set out to determine what things the reader demands, whether consciously or unconsciously, to find on the front page of each edition. The answers were illuminating.

It appeared, first of all, that "scare" headlines, boxcar type, and circus make-up aroused an instinctive feeling of distrust. The paper which used these tactics to grab the reader by the throat might be read, but it would not be respected or even believed. And the conclusions as to content were equally revealing. The newspaper reader, it was made clear, wanted to find these things on the front page:

The top international story of the day.

The most significant news from Ottawa.

The activities of the provincial government.

A story from city hall.

A report on finance or business.

A report on an area of interest involving the reader personally, as in health, consumer prices, education, or religion.

It will be noted that there is no demand here for scandal, crime, sex, or sensation. As every editor knows, these must be on the front page too, and a story involving crime or sex may well outdraw all the rest in readership. The story from Ottawa may not even be read by the subscriber who insists that it be there. But the lesson is clear: unless the newspaper gives relative prominence to the news of real significance, the reader will judge that it has failed in its job. He may already have seen it on television or heard it on radio; he wants to see it in print.

## PUBLISHING PHILOSOPHY

In a business devoted to putting ideas in print, it is noteworthy that few newspapers have attempted to put down in writing, for the guidance of their own writers and editors, the basic principles on which they operate. This is not to say that they do not know what they are doing. For the most part a body of practice has evolved, like the British Constitution, out of precedent and tradition. It is passed on verbally, and new practitioners take it in partly by osmosis.

In Canada, one paper which has attempted a codification of its publishing philosophy, in terms directly applicable to the rush of meeting deadlines, is the Toronto *Star*, which furnished editors with a general statement of aims and a specific list of Page One guidelines. These documents are worth attention not because they are peculiar to the *Star* but precisely because they are not; they represent a synthesis of Canadian newspaper practice. It is safe to say they would be accepted without significant revision in every Canadian newsroom.



Here is the statement of editorial aims:

1. To provide a newspaper that appeals to all the people rather than to particular groups or classes.
2. To provide thorough coverage of political and economic affairs so that the electorate may be well informed.
3. To provide analysis and background so that the significance of the news is communicated to the reader.
4. To provide thorough coverage of problems that are matters for political, economic, or social reform.
5. To provide columns combining hard facts, analysis, and opinion by writers of authority and special competence.
6. To provide thorough coverage of the metropolitan area, through stories that reflect the lives, interests, and activities of the people who live there.
7. To provide topical stories involving human interest and humour.
8. To provide coverage of significant events outside the metropolitan area which have the special depth provided by the paper's own on-the-spot reporters as well as by wire services, syndicate services, and special correspondents.
9. To provide advisory services for readers in matters that concern their personal lives.
10. To provide special coverage of areas that concern larger special groups, such as sports fans, investors, and housewives.
11. To provide special coverage of new developments, trends, and the people who work in specialized areas such as politics, economics, medicine, and the arts.
12. To communicate stories effectively and authoritatively.
13. To provide stories that are fair and accurate.
14. To use visual material as well as words for conveying the reality and character of events in the news.
15. To report the news in a responsible manner, avoiding exaggeration, distortion, slanting, and sensationalism.
16. To use display, layout, and typography to make the newspaper attractive to the reader and to make it easy for him to scan, recognize, and select the items he will read.
17. To recruit and train the best people available; to reward performance; to provide opportunities and encouragement for staff to develop and achieve their full potential.
18. To foster innovation and creativity; to find new ways to gather and present news and to re-examine constantly the concept of news.

This ideological statement should be read in conjunction with the detailed list of Page One guidelines. The following is a slightly condensed version, omitting references which are special to the *Star* and retaining those which apply to newspapers generally:

The basic objective of Page One is to present the day's most significant and interesting news, including pictures, in the most attractive manner.

The choice of stories for the front page should reflect the paper's news judgment and values. News stories about subjects that the paper considers to be important should be given appropriate display. News values should remain constant through all editions and through all days of the week. Thus a major story breaking in the final edition one day should be carefully considered as a Page One story in the first edition the next day. [Comment: this is an important departure from the hoary newspaper tradition that the latest story automatically gets the biggest play.]

The focal points of the front page are the art and the black line [that is the story most prominently displayed, with or without a streamer headline.] The art must be chosen carefully, weighing both significance and impact. Both are required. One without the other is not enough.

The art must be displayed so that visually, the reader grasps immediately what the picture is about. This means the focal point of the picture should be above the fold. Generally, the page is built around the picture.

The black line should represent the most significant happening of the day. The size of the headline should be determined by the importance of the story.

Starting with the black line, the day's important stories should flow downwards, generally emphasizing vertical make-up. For example, under a five-column picture, two two-column heads separated by a box are better than one five-column headline.

The red line story [that is the story given second prominence] should contain a strong human interest or consumer element. While it should not be frivolous and should have some significance, it may be an offbeat story, and frequently will be a local story.

Besides the black-line and red-line stories, the front page should include one other major piece of good reading. This might be a standup "depth" story prepared in advance, a background development out of overnight news, an exclusive interview, or some other story that lends itself to feature treatment, frequently in multi-column setting.

The bottom of the front page should be anchored with a zipper – another offbeat or human-interest story with a strong attraction to all readers. Again this should ideally be an unexpected story – something the reader will be pleasantly surprised to find at the bottom of the day's news.

The paper is intended to appeal to all people in the community and this means there should be something on the front page that will attract every reader. But the front page should also establish the significance of all that is going on in the reader's world that day.

This is done by a representation of stories from all sources as well as different kinds of stories. The most important events of the day – in the city, in the province, in Ottawa, and in the world – should all be represented on the front page. The day's best human interest, feature, humour, and news stories should also be present. From time to time, as news developments warrant, there should be representation from all departments and from all bureaus and beats.

The news editor should feel free to dip into any department or any part of the paper for a front page story. Ideally, he should end up with the ten or twelve best stories, whatever their source, available from that day's file.

The overall impression should be of a busy page that reflects a busy world. The item count should range between 12 and 15 stories and pictures. The head sizes, while chosen to indicate the importance of the story, should be large enough to contribute to the busy impression.

Turns [that is continuations from Page One] should be kept to a minimum – in general, no more than four, and preferably only one or two.

The front page should avoid falling into a day-after-day sameness that tends to make the reader feel that nothing new is happening. On the other hand, it should avoid such radical changes from one day to the next that the reader feels uncomfortable and uneasy with a strange paper.

So much for working guidelines. They are unexceptionable, and to the extent that they are observed they should produce a national press that is above criticism.

## UP AGAINST THE WALL

But the air is full of criticism. Why? What are the reasons for the widespread belief that the press is failing to do a responsible job of keeping the public fully and accurately informed? Is it true that Canada's newspapers distort the truth to serve special interests? That they are subject to hidden pressure from advertisers? That they play up the bad news and play down the good news? That they operate a gigantic combine in restraint of free opinion, excluding from publication not only

dissenting opinions but even the information on which dissent might be based? That they are careless, poorly informed, and irresponsible? That they invade privacy, ignore accepted canons of good taste, and sacrifice principle to profit? All these accusations are made and the industry must answer to them if it is to retain the respect and confidence of its public. This report cannot answer them, but the remainder of it will be devoted to an examination of the major areas where the press is in trouble.

## CONCENTRATION OF OWNERSHIP

In its economic aspects, this is the subject of another report; it is the implications for dissemination of information that concern us here. Almost half of the daily-newspaper circulation in Canada is vested in three chains: Southam Press (18.1%), F.P. Publications (18.2%), and Thomson Newspapers (8.4). The Desmarais group controls four of the nine dailies, plus thirteen weeklies, in Quebec; and K.C. Irving has acquired all the English-language daily newspapers in New Brunswick. Some of these chains, in addition, have interests in radio and television stations.

What is most disturbing about this concentration of ownership is the fact that, except in five cities, all the chain-owned newspapers are published in single-newspaper towns. There is no local competitor to stimulate their enterprise in covering the news or to provide a diversity of political opinion. And where the single newspaper is allied with local radio and television, the combined operation has a near-monopoly of the means of communication. In the absence of a national newspaper, millions of Canadians have no range of choice in the paper they buy.

In 1962, at a time when numerous mergers and chain acquisitions had aroused acute public concern in Great Britain, a royal commission under Lord Shawcross was appointed to study the social implications of the trend toward monopoly. It was concerned only with newspaper amalgamations; the situation there was not complicated, as it is in Canada, by multiple-media ownership.

The commission found that there was an obvious danger that variety of opinion might be stifled if one proprietor came to control a number of newspapers that formerly presented varied and independent views. On the other hand, some mergers and acquisitions were necessary to keep unprofitable newspapers alive. But mergers for any other reason, it held, were likely to be against the public interest.

The commission therefore recommended the establishment of a Press Amalgamations Court to scrutinize all such transactions and prohibit them if they were found to be against the public interest. To the objection that this would be an interference with freedom of the press, it responded by quoting a judgment of Justice Black, in an American case involving the Associated Press:

The argument is made that to apply the Sherman [anti-trust] Act to this association of publishers constitutes an abridgment of the freedom of the press guaranteed by the First Amendment. It would be strange indeed however if the grave concern for freedom of the press which prompted adoption of the First Amendment should be read as a command that the government was without power to protect that freedom. The First Amendment, far from providing an argument against application of the Sherman Act, here provides powerful reasons to the contrary. That Amendment rests on the assumption that the widest



possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources is essential to the welfare of the public, that a free press is a condition of a free society . . . Freedom to publish means freedom for all and not for some. Freedom to publish is guaranteed by the constitution, but freedom to combine and keep others from publishing is not. Freedom of the press from government interference does not sanction repression of that freedom by private interests. The First Amendment provides not the slightest support for the contention that a combination to restrain trade in news and views has any constitutional immunity.

The Shawcross Commission also anticipated that its proposed Amalgamations Court would be objected to because it would interfere with the rights of shareholders, and because it subjected the newspaper industry to discriminatory regulation. The Commission's answer was that the newspaper industry is not an industry *comme les autres*. The public interest is involved in a special way. Freedom and variety in the publication of news and opinion are of paramount public interest, and they are not a component of other competitive businesses.

The Shawcross recommendation was adopted; in 1965, Britain established a permanent Monopolies Commission which examines every sizeable newspaper merger proposal from the standpoint of the public interest. Its record is not on the face of it impressive: it has studied twenty-six applications and reported negatively on only one. There are good grounds for believing, however, that the existence of the Commission, with a defined policy, has prevented a number of patently undesirable takeovers from reaching the stage of a formal application.

Only seldom in recent Canadian experience has a newspaper merger come under official scrutiny; the Combines Investigation Act applies to products, and newspapers are a service industry. In 1957 Southam Press, which owned the Vancouver *Province*, joined with Donald Cromie, owner of the Vancouver *Sun*, to form Pacific Press Ltd. The Restrictive Trade Practices Commission investigated and found that the merger did not constitute a restrictive monopoly, but it recommended that no further ownership change should be made without court approval. However, the Commission took no action when in 1963 the Cromie interest in Pacific Press was sold to another chain, F. P. Publications.

The central concept in Justice Douglas's decision was the necessity for "the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources." There is not much antagonism between members of Canadian newspaper chains.

## PRESSURES FROM ADVERTISERS

This is a murky area. Cases undoubtedly exist of legitimate news stories being suppressed or toned down as the result of influence brought to bear by important advertisers; but they are rarer than is often suspected, and they are by their nature hard to document. Manufacturers of automobiles and cigarettes are major sources of advertising revenue, but no newspaper hesitates to print the facts of lung cancer or Ralph Nader's accusations against the automotive industry.

Blatant interference by advertisers in editorial decisions is not unknown in Canada, but in recent years it has been more apparent in the periodical press, which is more economically vulnerable, than in the newspapers. In 1962, Sidney Katz

wrote a series of articles for *Maclean's* magazine on over-medication. Every drug manufacturer in Canada protested, and one of them cancelled \$80,000 worth of scheduled advertising. Shortly thereafter the *Financial Post*, also published by Maclean-Hunter Ltd., commented adversely on a takeover of Canadian Oil by Shell. The president of Shell pulled *all* his company's advertising out of *all* Maclean-Hunter publications. In both cases the Maclean-Hunter management stood up to the pressure. A struggling publisher, or one who puts profit before editorial liberty, might hesitate to risk the alienation of a major revenue source.

Such overt interference is, however, seldom attempted. When it occurs, it comes usually from local, not national advertisers, and, to the credit of Canadian publishers, it is generally repulsed. Arnold Edinborough, in *Mass Media in Canada*, published in 1962, asserted that advertisers do not try to influence editorial content for the simple reason that they need the newspapers as much as the newspapers need them. But Desmond Morton, in *Canadian Forum* for July, 1969, argued that while this may be true, it is irrelevant. "Advertisers don't use pressure," Morton wrote.

It doesn't matter whether the North Bay *Nugget* belongs to Max Bell, Roy Thomson or a local dry goods merchant. They are all, without a single exception, in the same kind of hands. They all belong to the Canadian business community and they all do what the business community wants. And if Canadian businessmen assume an automatic, infallible identity between their views and those of every right-thinking Canadian, they are hardly unique among the oligarchs of history.

It is a valid comment. The interests of the advertising community run generally with those of the publishers. Newspapers are business enterprises, and publishers are businessmen. They are not notably given to fouling their own tidy nest.

## INVASION OF PRIVACY

The extent to which the public interest overrides private rights is highly debatable and not subject to precise definition. One of the commonest complaints against the press is that it plays the role of Peeping Tom — and publishes the results to the world. At one level, intrusion on privacy is in practice a matter of taste which can best be policed by the forces of the marketplace. If the public is affronted by what it reads, it will cease to buy.

This is happening in Canada. Readers condemn a newspaper which openly violates the right of the private individual to be left alone. The best example is provided by the diminishing exploitation of personal tragedy. As every newspaperman knows, people caught at moments of extreme shock are docile and highly amenable to suggestion. A mother who has just seen her child killed by a truck can be posed for a photograph, clutching a doll, her face distorted by grief. The result is a powerful "human-interest" picture, of a kind which once was standard newspaper fare; but modern readers object so vigorously that few newspapers now indulge in such tricks.

The question is much more difficult in the case of public personalities. When a bachelor prime minister takes lunch with a blonde, or a cruise with a brunette, has

the public a right to know? Is the private life of a public man his own business, and his alone? In a totalitarian state it is; in a free society, it is not. Where the news is managed, and the press is controlled, and there is only one party to vote for, it matters little whether the people know anything about their masters. In a society where the citizen must cast an informed vote for those who will govern him, it matters greatly. We empower our public men to manage our country, our common affairs, our economic future – but not to manage our news. Within certain decent limits, we need to know what ideals inspire them, what knowledge informs them, what pressures mould them, what weaknesses impair them. When they employ professional image-makers, we are entitled to ask whether the image is correct.

The sacrifice of privacy is sometimes a heavy price to pay for a career in the public service, but it is a price that has to be paid. To take an extreme but pertinent case, it may be argued that the journalistic hue and cry after Senator Edward Kennedy went beyond decent limits of innuendo, conjecture, assumption, and speculation. But, since he was a potential candidate for his country's highest office, the reasons for his conduct are a matter of legitimate public concern.

## INACCURACY AND DISTORTION

A modern newspaper is a marvel of productive genius. Every twenty-four hours it assembles news from all over the world, edits, prints, and distributes it for a few cents, along with comment on its significance. The speed with which the efforts of thousands of people around the globe are brought together in a coherent whole, and the technology which puts the product almost instantly in the hands of the reader, are dazzling to the non-initiate. But speed breeds error, and technical genius is not a guarantee of reliability. It has been calculated that in a single paragraph of factual statement, there are 10,000 ways of committing mistakes. Reporters are humanly fallible; informants may be misunderstood; eyewitnesses are notoriously unreliable. Even the two parties to an interview – reporter and subject – may sincerely disagree on what was said: the subject insists he was misquoted; the reporter has notes made at the time to support the version he printed. Much of the news is rewritten from the original source; errors of emphasis and meaning – if not of fact – creep in with each rewrite. Finally, a hastily written headline can give a misleading impression of the story it tries to summarize.

Given the speed at which newspapers are produced, inaccuracy is inevitable, if not excusable. The best that can be asked of editors is that they will insist on the most careful possible checking and publicly acknowledge errors when they are detected or pointed out. The best newspapers do this. The *Globe and Mail*, for example, acknowledges even trivial errors under a prominent boxed heading, "Our Mistake." Some papers maintain their own "bureaus of accuracy" to check complaints and see that corrections are printed. Unfortunately, this practice is not yet general.

On the very practical level, much error could be avoided if Canadian reporters were encouraged or required to learn shorthand. Few of them do. British journalists, many of whom are now working in Canada, customarily use shorthand, and their notes tend to be more reliable than sketchy longhand scribbles. Tape



recorders are useful in some situations, but the necessity to transcribe is a delaying factor.

Inadvertent error may be a venial sin; slanting and distortion are not. Flagrant misrepresentation is increasingly rare in Canadian journalism, discouraged as much as anything by the increasing sophistication of the reading public. It can, however, take subtle forms. The temptation to "slant" is especially strong at election time in papers with a strong political bias.

It happens that an interesting case of political "slanting" has been documented by Dennis Schroeder, a journalism student at the University of Western Ontario working under the direction of Prof. Earle Beattie. Schroeder analysed the coverage given to the three political parties by the Toronto *Telegram* in the final week of the October, 1967 provincial election campaign in Ontario. The *Telegram* editorially supports the Conservative party; in this campaign it evidently considered the N.D.P., not the Liberals, to be the chief opponent.

Schroeder did not measure merely the news space given by the *Telegram* to the contending parties. He worked out a system for scoring stories on the basis of such elements as position in the paper (front page or inside), prominence on the page, size of headline, typographical treatment, use of photographs. He gave positive scores to stories which were well displayed and treated, negative scores to those which were "buried" among comic pages and truss ads. He also broke each story into units and analysed the units for "loaded" words and phrases which implied value judgments, favorable or unfavorable. These are what the semanticist S.I. Hayakawa calls "snarl-words" and "purr-words." Headlines were subjected to the same examination and given plus or minus scores.

The result was illuminating. On the straight space count, the Conservative party was given 808½ column inches; the N.D.P. had 585 column inches of coverage, and the Liberals 445½ column inches. But when all "loading" factors were taken into account, the final score on the Schroeder scale was: Conservatives, 1873½; Liberals, 339; N.D.P., minus 916.

Newspaper readers in Toronto have at least a partial antidote to news slanting; they have access to competing newspapers with possibly other slants. In a city with a single newspaper, they are clearly subject to the possibility of ideological brainwashing.

## GOOD NEWS, BAD NEWS

To a certain school of newspaper journalism, an ideal headline would read: "Cop Slugs Citizen." Or, even better: "Citizen Slugs Cop." Happily, this school is in decline; but conflict and controversy are still in very large measure the staple diet of daily journalism. They are easy, dramatic, and arresting; they sell newspapers. Good news is no news. One publisher admitted it recently:

We are zealous to report nearly everything that is going wrong in our society, in our country and in the world — and we should be, because it is only by exposure and debate that ills and injustices can be corrected. But we are not nearly so keen to discover and report the things that are going right.

Of course it is not news, as Norman DePoe once pointed out, that the daily Air Canada flight from Vancouver arrived on time with all passengers safe. It would be news if it did not. But positive things do happen, and go unreported. Just before the outbreak of the Six Day War in the Middle East, a group of Christian ministers in Toronto collaborated in a statement of concern and sympathy with the fears of the Jewish community. The newspapers, and the television and radio news editors, failed to find it newsworthy. What they did find newsworthy, however, was a later statement by a leading Toronto rabbi bitterly reproaching his Christian *confrères* for failing to offer moral support to their Jewish brethren in their hour of anxiety. This accent on the negative had a predictable result: resentment and misunderstanding between the Christian and Jewish communities were exacerbated when they might have been allayed.

It is, of course, argued by the defence that the first duty of a newspaper is to be read, and that people are more interested in reading about conflict and tension than about peace and order. It requires hard work and imagination to report constructive development dramatically and vigorously, but it can be done, and it is the job of a responsible press to do it. The continuing Canadian story of the 1960s was the so-called "quiet revolution" in Quebec. It was for the most part inadequately reported. The English-language press told of clashes and confrontations, but failed substantially to record the gains in education and social justice that contributed to the ferment. And the newspapers of Quebec, which maintain not a single correspondent in English Canada, failed to inform their readers of the steadily improving attitude toward reconciliation and the redress of ancient grievances. National unity would have been better served by a press which knew how to accentuate the positive.

## THE PRESS GALLERY

Mackenzie King called it "an adjunct of Parliament," and the hundred-odd members of the Ottawa parliamentary press corps gravely accepted the accolade as no more than their due. In all truth, they have a vital responsibility as the essential bridge between Parliament and people. But no prime minister since King has held them in such high regard, and the last decade has seen a sharp decline in the confidence reposed in the press corps by the politicians whose doings they report.

It is not a paradox that this disenchantment may be a measure of the Press Gallery's effectiveness; the politicians do not constitute a wholly impartial jury. It is accepted in the trade that the Great Pipeline Debate of 1957 became a watershed in the relationship between the governors and the press. It was a time of extravagant emotions. There were scenes of disorder in the Commons. Donald Fleming was banished by the Speaker, and his colleagues draped his empty seat with a Union Jack. Finally the government cut off debate by closure. The reporters in the Gallery, by this time as full of passion as the participants, abandoned objectivity and thumped the government in a hundred newspapers.

Later, most of them conceded – and some of them regretted – that they had lost their cool. But the style of Ottawa reporting had undergone a lasting change.

Careful neutrality was Out; point-of-view writing was In. "The pipeline was a taste of raw meat," Blair Fraser confessed to June Callwood. "Now we can't leave it alone." A neutral observer remarked that, since the pipeline debate, "the real party in opposition is always the Press Gallery." In successive governments, members of both the major political parties have obviously agreed. Three prime ministers have held office since the pipeline debate; all three have been goaded into scolding the Ottawa writers for sins of both commission and omission.

Point-of-view writing, however, is here to stay, and not only in politics. If the public hearing into the CBC's "Air of Death" programme demonstrated anything, it was that today's committed journalist has jettisoned ancient standards of objectivity and impartiality on controversial issues. This is the Age of Analysis, and Canadians as a people are engaged in a process of critical self-examination. No institution is exempt, including Parliament.

The operative question is whether the self-appointed critics themselves apply consistent standards of analysis before taking up the cudgels. It is precisely when they do that they earn the kind of wary distrust accorded to a ticking parcel in a Montreal mailbox. A writer whose dispatches faithfully follow the line of Party "A" can be dealt with even by members of Party "B", because they know where he stands. But when a politician is praised one day and clobbered the next, by the same writer in the same column, the result is frustration and fury.

The Ottawa Press Gallery has its quota of party hacks, but the evidence is that the best of them, and those with the largest followings, are their own men and that their judgments are based on a respectable foundation of application, research, and sophisticated comparison. The George Bains and Charles Lynches are seldom to be faulted for neglect of their homework.

If the reporters sometime succeed in confusing or misleading the electorate, there are occasions when they may almost be forgiven. One such occurred in August, 1969, when Hon. Otto Lang announced a tough new federal policy on water pollution, and flew to Toronto on the first leg of a tour of provincial capitals to invite co-operation of the ten provincial jurisdictions. He conferred with George Kerr, Ontario minister of energy and resources, who subsequently held a press conference. The conference, as displayed on CBC television news that evening, consisted entirely of Mr. Kerr's insistence that control of water pollution was a provincial responsibility, and that Ontario, for one, would brook no interference from Ottawa. As reported in the *Globe and Mail* the following morning, Mr. Kerr was on a different wicket. He oozed co-operation, welcomed the proposed Canada Water Act, and declared that Premier Robarts "is even more determined than I that we are going to co-operate with Ottawa on this." The same paper, on the same page, reported that the Ontario Water Resources Commission had issued a strong statement "opposing the federal initiative on almost every count, and stating that Canada-wide policies and standards of water quality control would not be practical."

The O.W.R.C. is under Mr. Kerr's jurisdiction. Questioned about the puzzling discrepancy of response, Mr. Kerr explained that the O.W.R.C. statement had been prepared before the meeting with Mr. Lang, which had removed any fears that the federal programme might interfere with Ontario's already developed water



pollution programme. The O.W.R.C. brief, Mr. Kerr added, did not represent his own views. If the Ontario public remained less than well informed about their government's position, the confusion could not be blamed on inadequate reporting.

June Callwood, examining the Press Gallery in *Maclean's* magazine, found that parliamentarians ascribe to reporters the motives of a heckler at a political meeting: if a story is critical, it follows that the writer is a political opponent. "In actual fact," she concluded,

most members of the Press Gallery are neutral in politics, performing the same workmanlike job of reporting on legislation, speeches and reports that they would if assigned to cover labor unions or a chess tournament. Their political bias is derived from the prevailing wind from the nonstop caucus of newsmen in the Gallery lounge; political allegiance in them is the loose sand of consensus.

If the Ottawa Press Gallery is unequal to its job — which, by absolute standards, it is — the reason lies at least partly in the tradition of secrecy in the Canadian public service, the entrenched but dubious notion that departmental policies are the department's business, not the public's. This applies particularly, and most unfortunately, in the areas of foreign affairs and fiscal policy. Journalists who have experienced both systems compare the Ottawa tradition unfavorably with that of Washington where the practice is to hold many more background briefings — not-for-attribution seminars, conducted by experts, to explain the factors that influence government decisions. The practice is open to the suspicion that the government is attempting to manage the news, but given an alert and independent press corps it is an indispensable educative process in the complex business of modern government.

## CURRENT TRENDS

Finally, a few capsule observations on the current trend of Canadian newspaper performance. It is upward. The 1960s brought a noticeable improvement in the attitude of the press to its job and in the execution of it in at least half a dozen areas:

### FUNCTION

Interpretation is the name of the game. Information remains the staple commodity of the printed press, but increasingly the newspapers see their function as providing an evaluation of events. This results not only from the increased sophistication of the audience but from the new role of radio and television. Newspaper "scoops" no longer exist; immediacy in reporting has been captured by the electronic media. This leaves to the newspapers the field of backgrounding and explaining the events which the public have already seen on television. Newspapers in effect become daily magazines, reflecting on events and selecting for emphasis the significant details which go unspotted in the hurly-burly of instant reportage.

This interpretative function is both useful and marketable. The most avid readers of an account of a football game are those who saw the game being played. They buy a paper to find expert comment on the key plays, the reasons for the coach's

strategy, the "inside" story of defensive strengths and weaknesses. The newspapers, therefore, are increasingly devoting themselves to "soft" as opposed to "hard" items – the news behind the headlines. When the Economic Council reports that one-quarter of all Canadians live below the poverty line, the newspapers assign their own task forces to explore the meaning of poverty in human terms and to seek out expert opinion on measures to fight it. They do the same in the fields of race relations, national unity, labour issues, social and cultural problems.

### A NEW SENSE OF PURPOSE

The newspapers are consciously trying to serve their communities better. In an increasingly urban society, local governments become more remote from the people. The newspapers, with an eye to self-interest, see an opportunity to appoint themselves the representative of the individual citizen vis-à-vis Big Government. They dig harder for local news and local identification. "Citizen Slugs Cop" is not the end of the story; it is the springboard for a thorough examination into the relationship between police and public.

### REVIVAL OF REGIONAL NEWSPAPERS

This local emphasis, in the metropolitan newspapers, comes about at the expense of regional coverage; the big-city newspapers, concentrating on metropolitan affairs, no longer give the attention they once did to daily news throughout the province. (There are exceptions; the *Edmonton Journal* takes the whole North for its beat). But the local concentration in itself provides an opportunity for the smaller, regional dailies to do a better local job. No longer swamped in their own bailiwick by the richer paper from the metropolis, they are digging harder to be indispensable to their own constituents.

### TECHNICAL IMPROVEMENTS

The newspapers are becoming professionally better organized, more attractive, more intelligible. Technical innovation on the mechanical production side is matched by more professionalism in presenting the news. In particular, they are departmentalized to an extent unknown ten years ago; international news, community news, news of science, business, and the arts are grouped in recognizable and related sections. The whole is better displayed through use of improved typography, layout, and illustration.

### IMPROVED REPORTING

Accuracy is more prized than ever before – not merely the accuracy of dates and initials and correct quotation, but the underlying accuracy of weight and meaning as well. When a report must be abridged or a speech digested, there is a serious effort to make the condensation scrupulously fair.

## PERSONNEL

The newspapers are better staffed. Reporters are better educated, and specialists are routinely recruited to deal with such recondite fields as science and law.

## SUMMARY

In short, the newspapers are improving. This is not to ascribe to publishers and editors any special nobility of character; in an era of perfected and fiercely competitive communications, the newspapers must improve or die. It is probably true that Canadians are as well served by their newspapers as any people in the world. If there is one criticism of them more damaging than any other, it is that they are largely of one stripe, representing one sectional interest in the wider community; that they do not provide Justice Black's prescription of "the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources." They are members of one club, and it is not an easy club for outsiders to join.

In *The Bad News* (a book published in 1967, but not yet generally circulated) a leading Canadian journalist and critic, Ken Lefolii, wrote:

The corporate press appears to have acquired an invulnerable monopoly on the distribution of news to a significant national audience. The press corporations use their monopoly to defend and promote the interests of the corporate order, of which they are full members. The bureaucrats who control the corporate order are allied with the official bureaucracy to constitute a privileged estate that actually governs our society in many, perhaps most, important respects. The governing estate pursues two primary interests, political stability and economic growth. Since disclosure and dispute might encourage political experiment or economic change, the corporate press chooses to discourage both.

This criticism — that the mass of the people are excluded from participating in decisions made by a governing estate without reference to the public — is sufficiently widespread to command consideration. However competent and well-intentioned the national press, it must communicate in both directions.



## Chapter 2

### MAGAZINES IN CANADA

Dean Walker

#### INTRODUCTION

This paper is about the main “magazines” in Canada, their economic health and their prospects.<sup>1</sup> It pays most attention to a small group of publications that meet various criteria related to size and significance (see appendix I). It raises issues but does not attempt to resolve them.

It includes what the advertising trade usually calls “consumer magazines” (those that carry general advertising and are distributed by newsstand sales or the mails), and also publications that advertising people usually call “weekend supplements” (those that carry general advertising and are distributed as part of the contents of the weekend newspaper). However, it does not include weekend supplements such as *The Globe Magazine* that are carried by only one newspaper. Nor does it include comics even though these may be carried by many newspapers. Nor does it include such French-language weekly newspapers as *Allo Police*, *Dernière Heure*, *Echo Vedettes*.

To be considered a “magazine” for the purposes of this report, a publication must be issued at least four times a year.

#### YESTERDAY AND TOMORROW

It was in 1751 that Bartholomew Green arrived in Canada with the country’s first printing press. Within a year, the “government” was involved in Canadian publishing, because Green’s successor had been appointed King’s Printer. Many early presses in Canada made much of their revenue by printing government notices.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the first modern mass circulation magazines appeared in the United States. They were “modern” because they were

---

<sup>1</sup> Many of the magazines referred to in this paper filed financial returns with the Committee separately, on the basis that figures of individual publications would not be disclosed. For that reason, some statistics originally included in this paper have been omitted, although they were not in this instance provided confidentially.



sold to the reader for only a few cents and made most of their money by selling advertising space. Today, some magazines are not sold to readers at all, but are given away and make all their money from advertising.

By 1905, Canada had three general national magazines: *Canadian Magazine*, *Canadian Home Journal*, and *Saturday Night*. Then J.B. MacLean, who already owned a number of healthy trade papers, launched an ambitious general publication which he was eventually to name *Maclean's*. Twenty years later he launched *Chatelaine*. Today, the company he founded publishes more trade papers and more general magazines than any other in Canada.

## COMING AND GOING

By 1930, Canada had ninety-six magazines, including such special-interest efforts as *Nor'West Farmer*, *Dogs in Canada*, and *Canadian Musical*. Yet publishing was no automatic route to wealth. New magazines kept appearing, but many others died. In the 1920s, fourteen Canadian magazines appeared and twenty-three went out of existence. In the 1930s, seventy-five new ones appeared and sixty-five dropped dead. In the 1940s, ninety-two new ones arrived and seventy disappeared.

In the 1950s, for the first time, deaths outnumbered births, and Canada's publishers grew worried. A powerful, new advertising medium, television, was eating into their revenues and also into the leisure time of their readers. They had always faced fierce competition for readers, but now the American magazines were attracting Canadian advertising as well. By Order-in-Council in September, 1960, the government appointed a Royal Commission "to enquire into and make recommendations concerning the position of and prospects for Canadian magazines and periodicals." It usually was known from then on as "The O'Leary Commission" for its chairman, Grattan O'Leary.

There had long been some concern about the competition from American publications. In 1931, a Conservative government had applied a per-copy tariff against them; but three years later, a Liberal government repealed it on the ground that this interfered with the free flow of ideas between neighbouring countries. In the first year of the Second World War, a ban was imposed against importing American weekend newspapers. (This helped boost the circulation of *Star Weekly*, and the latter remained prosperous for a number of years.) In 1956, a Liberal government imposed an advertising tax on "Canadian editions" of American magazines, but the following year the Conservatives repealed it.

## FOR LOVE OR MONEY?

If Canadian governments have proved undecided about protecting Canadian publications, it is presumably because there are two separate questions involved: the degree of protection deserved, if any, by business enterprises; and the degree of protection deserved, if any, by cultural enterprises. It has always been easy to muddy the waters and difficult to get the two aspects in focus. Publishers wanting



protection for business reasons can always claim that the government should provide it to them for nationalistic reasons.

For an argument based on patriotism to be meaningful, however, magazines would have to be considered to offer the country, as a national print medium, advantages not otherwise available through newspapers (a financially healthy, local print medium), or through broadcasting (a government-subsidized, national electronic medium).

Is there something special about magazines? In 1950, the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences had declared:

It is still the fact that in Canada "news" is largely local or regional in character. . . . In any small town in Canada the destruction of the bakery or a municipal scandal would sweep from the front page of the local paper the results of an election in a different province. . . .

The periodical press of Canada . . . does undoubtedly make a conscious and, it seems to us, a successful appeal to the country as a whole; and in our periodical press we have our closest approximation to a national literature. It has given encouragement to Canadians writing about Canada, and not infrequently has the dubious pleasure of nurturing Canadian writers to the point where they can sell their wares to more affluent American periodicals. We are informed that the important Canadian magazines have a Canadian content of seventy or eighty percent, that they do attempt to interpret Canada as a whole to all Canadians, that they comment vigorously upon national issues in a non-partisan spirit, and that they manage to survive and even to flourish although American periodicals outsell them by more than two to one in their own Canadian market.

. . . The [magazines'] problems . . . seem to us to symbolize many of the problems of Canada as a nation and of Canadians as a people. . . . We do have, nonetheless, a periodical press which, in spite of all temptations and in spite of the occasional defections, insists on remaining resolutely Canadian. . . .

## A SOURCE FOR SIGNIFICANCE

Ten years later, Beland Honderich, then editor-in-chief of the Toronto *Star*, suggested to the O'Leary Commission why there was something especially important about magazines. "A newspaper," he said,

concentrates on the events of the last 24 hours, and its writers and editors may have to meet four of five deadlines a day. . . . They simply do not have the time for the reflection and research that can be put into magazine articles and editorials. A big national story which the daily press must cover by bits and pieces can be pulled together in a magazine article so that its real significance dawns on the reader for the first time.

Honderich pointed out also that only magazines have a nationwide readership. "Thus they occupy a position comparable to that of the national broadcasting system in visual and sound communication. It is hard to imagine how a strong national consciousness could be promoted and maintained in the absence of either."

When the Commission published its report, it agreed with Honderich that magazines matter.

So far as the printed word is concerned, it is largely left to our periodical press, to our magazines big and little, to make a conscious appeal to the nation, to try to interpret Canada to all Canadians, to bring a sense of oneness to our scattered

communities. It is necessary but to note the veritable deluge of United States publications submerging Canadian print on our newsstands to understand the magnitude and, in the past, the impossibility of their task. . . . Here, inescapably, is the stuff of national concern. . . .

The tremendous expansion of communications in the United States has given that nation the world's most penetrating and effective apparatus for the transmission of ideas. Canada, more than any other nation, is naked to that force. . . .

The Commissioners were convinced that Canadian magazines were in an especially vulnerable position. They had examined the situation elsewhere and learned that

with the exception of Canada, by-product publishing is not a threat to the existence of the periodical press in any of the countries examined by the commission. In some countries overflow circulation is heavy, but nowhere as severe as in Canada. In none of the other countries is it compounded by substantial overflow advertising. . . .

All countries examined by the Commission assist periodicals generally, in one way or another. All have legislation directed particularly at the press. It is interesting to note that, among these nations, Canada appears to have less restriction and regulation of expression, less assistance and less protection of domestic publishing than nearly all the others.

## YANKEE STAY HOME

Thus buttressed, the Commission proceeded to define a "Canadian magazine" and to recommend penalties against any that didn't meet its definition. A Canadian periodical, it decided, was

one published in Canada, owned either by Canadian citizens or, if a corporation, by a company incorporated under the laws of Canada or of one of its provinces, and which is controlled and directed by Canadian citizens and not a licensee of, or otherwise substantially the same as, a periodical owned or controlled outside Canada.

Further,

a Canadian periodical is one edited in Canada by a staff normally resident in Canada, its type-setting (in whatever language) and its entire mechanical production must be in Canada and its publication must be from a place or places within Canada.

After that a "foreign periodical" proved easy to define: one which does not meet all the requirements of a Canadian periodical.

The Commission decided that a nation's advertising expenditures should support its own media; and that a nation's media "must be aware of their responsibilities" and therefore not merely republish editorial matter "to support an advertising structure."

To make sure that advertisers and magazines henceforward would operate in line with such decisions the Commission recommended:

1. that money spent on advertising to Canadians in a foreign periodical should not be allowed as an income tax deduction;
2. that foreign periodicals containing advertising and coupons and inserts aimed at Canadians should not be allowed into Canada.

## NOTABLE EXCEPTIONS

Eventually these basic suggestions were put into law. However the two “Canadian editions” — *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* — that were taking the biggest bites out of Canadian advertising budgets were exempted, on the ground that they had been established in Canada for a number of years, and a reasonable government could hardly impose back-dated penalties. In May of 1969, however, former cabinet minister Walter Gordon declared in a speech that, while the magazine legislation was being drawn up,

the U.S. State Department went into action. Its representatives urged on behalf of the whole U.S. administration that nothing should be done which would in any way upset or annoy the late Mr. Henry Luce, the proprietor of *Time*.

It was submitted that Mr. Luce had great power in the United States through his magazines, *Time*, *Life* and *Fortune*, and that if he were irritated, the results could be most damaging both to Canada and to the U.S. administration.

The Canadian government concluded, quite rightly in my opinion, that there was considerable validity to these assertions respecting the influence of Mr. Luce and, accordingly, the Canadian edition of *Time* magazine was exempted from the proposed legislation.

*Time* and *The Reader's Digest* have since maintained their dominant position amongst Canadian consumer magazines. In 1958, they accounted for 42% of the advertising revenue of the main Canadian magazines; today they account for 56% of the revenue and 60% of the circulation of members of the Magazine Advertising Bureau.

The legislation did however prevent the establishment in Canada of further “Canadian editions.” No local issue of *Ladies Home Journal* appeared to challenge *Chatelaine*; no Canadian edition of *Saturday Review* to challenge *Saturday Night*; no split runs of American trade papers to challenge Canadian trade papers. And, of course, no Canadian edition of *Newsweek* appeared to challenge the Canadian edition of *Time*. And as they could no longer sell space to Canadian advertisers, other American magazines now gained only circulation revenue from their Canadian distribution. Consequently many stopped selling copies aggressively; since the Commission's report, Canadian sales of *Life* for example have dropped from 300,000 to about 225,000.

## SEEKING CITIZENSHIP

For their part, *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* have since made certain concessions to their Canadian subsidiaries which they have not made in the other countries in which they do business. Only the Canadian edition of *Time* for example, carries separate pages of domestic news. And only the Canadian subsidiary of *The Reader's Digest* Association has sold stock to the public. *Reader's Digest* in Canada employs more than 400 Canadians, and *Time* says it has more editorial people than business people on staff here.

During and immediately after the O'Leary Commission, total magazine advertising revenue in Canada dipped severely. *The Reader's Digest* took perhaps a worse pummeling than most — between 1960 and 1965 it lost 35% of its



advertising revenue — but almost all Canadian magazines took a loss. Advertisers and agencies found it simpler to switch budgets into other media than to try to sort out the rights and wrongs of the civil war among the publishers. Presumably they felt some conflict between their own nationalism, if any, and the attractions of the proven reader-appeal of big American publications. During this period, according to *The Reader's Digest's* Paul Zimmerman, he spent about 80% of his time fighting to stop his company being destroyed by various tentatively proposed government actions. During this period, a survey was made of the 100 largest magazine advertisers to learn what they would do if the O'Leary Commission's main recommendations were directed against the Canadian editions of *Time* and *The Reader's Digest*. Most replied that they would abandon magazine advertising altogether.

It was not until the mid-1960s that the magazine legislation was passed. After that the main magazines decided to bury the hatchet and to work together to promote their ailing industry. "We had stated our position to the Commission," explains Lloyd Hodgkinson, publisher of *Chatelaine* "and we had agreed that, whatever the outcome, we would live with it." Within a year or so, the main consumer magazines had banded together to form the Magazine Advertising Bureau which quickly became an effective promotional agency. Its revenues are based on a percentage of gross, so more than 50% of its costs are carried by *Time* and *The Reader's Digest*. The handful of big magazines remaining in Canada are no sicker than they were a few years ago because there are fewer of them to split the available advertising revenue.

Throughout North America today, magazine publishers grope for new patterns of appeal that will let them survive in the face of television's fierce competition for the advertising dollar; and in the face of the tendency of many city newspapers to become "daily magazines" as part of their own answer to broadcasting's competition.

## AMERICAN SCENE

In 1968, twelve magazines disappeared in the United States. One fatality was *The Reporter*, a twenty-year-old "serious" magazine that was absorbed into *Harper's*. Harry Golden's *The Carolina Israelite* was also mourned. Others that turned up their toes included *Sponsor*, *Cheetah*, *Elegant*, *Teen*, *The GQ Scene*, and *Non-Foods Business*. *Saturday Review* later commented that "1968 was the year that showed rather clearly the directions in which the magazine business is going. The old guard is departing but the new generation promises a profitable, if not especially inspiring, future." During the year, ninety-four new magazines had been started. Although total advertising pages dropped 2.4%, revenues jumped 3.2% and circulation 3.3%.

Since then, however, the venerable *Saturday Evening Post* has folded and in mid-1969 *This Week*, a large weekend supplement, went out of business, leaving only two national American newspaper supplements in existence.

## THE FUTURE

In the next few years, not only magazines but all print media will have to face up to a fundamental questioning of their reasons for existence because a revolution is occurring on three levels in the mass use of information.

*Selection:* So much material is being spewed out now that it becomes imperative to be able to select the material needed and desired. People ask: "What is worth printing? What is worth storing and retrieving? What is worth reading?" This suggests print media have a choice of two directions: either to produce a summary which one trusts to provide all the news in capsule (*Time*, for example, suggests that it is briefer than six daily newspapers and at least equally comprehensive); or to produce custom-made selections of all the material — and none other — that is exactly right for a particular reader.

In regard to the first approach; Chrysler Corporation executives already get four-times-a-day news interpretations which include the edited output of four wire services, daily newspapers, weekly newsmagazines, and more than a hundred other publications. The corporation provides the service because no publisher is meeting these businessmen's needs. As to the second approach, various professional associations are developing reader-profiles and key-word computer filing of titles and abstracts of new technical papers, so that each reader gets a list of all papers he ought to see — and of none that he need not see.

*Translation and Analysis:* Translating programmes are being developed for computer exploitation. The American military has one to rough-translate Vietnamese. The next step — a big one which may not occur soon — would be machine-assisted interpretation. Computers have been used to analyse the literary style of documents and can prove Homer and Homer alone wrote the *Odyssey*. Computers analyse retail sales trends in order to project future sales and update inventory. And, similarly, computers may one day be used for the analysis and interpretation of events. Print journalists are already losing the edge in finding and transmitting raw information, and therefore retreat to background and interpretation.

*Printing and Distribution:* Some of the most interesting developments are technological. RCA has a facsimile machine—a prototype of which is now running—that will transmit a page every ten seconds to a home facsimile machine. John Diebold suggests a combination of TV pictures plus home-facsimile-printer carrying background analysis. Instant typesetting, instant printing, instant editorial changes while the press is running, are now all technically practical. A New York *Times* Information Bank goes into operation early in 1971, and will eventually purvey all information in its files plus other people's reference libraries, other publications, even graphic material, to subscribers' TV screens or teletype-style printers. The American government is interested in a world information grid using communication satellites and computer memories. Theoretically all information of every sort can be digitalized and stored, retrieved very rapidly, and transmitted anywhere on earth in 1/15th of a second. As a result — and cause — of these

developments, there are increasingly frequent alliances between telecommunications/hardware corporations and information/software corporations.

In effect it seems that by 1975-1980 there can be reasonably widespread commercial development of information services direct to the home via TV and/or printer. By the end of the seventies people may look to these new services for most of the information they need.

Where will this leave "magazines"? To provide entertainment? One would expect TV to continue to satisfy most of the demand for that. To supply interpretation, selection, background? Perhaps — but is there much of a market for them? To provide glorious coloured pictures as *Life* and *National Geographic* do? TV will soon be able to match and improve on them. And instant books may provide the interpretation and background, particularly if the liveliest and most adventurous pocketbook people continue to develop at the rate they've been going in recent years; such "books" could include sound, sight, smell, and other packages along with their print.

Important innovations in communications and the media are happening — and will continue to happen — rapidly. Today's Canadian magazine publishers who hope to be still in business tomorrow are presumably wondering now just where they are going to fit.

## TODAY

### ECONOMICS

Magazines live almost entirely by the sale of advertising space. *Maclean's* and *Chatelaine* (English and French editions) earn a little more in subscription sales than they spend in generating them. *Saturday Night* breaks even or makes a nominal profit on subscription sales. Only 15% of the gross revenue of *Actualité* comes from subscriptions. *United Church Observer* receives 75% of its gross revenue from subscriptions, but that is only because it can call on hundreds of volunteer, unpaid salesmen within the church. Only *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* consistently make money from subscription sales. Apparently, they do not have to work so hard nor spend so much to persuade people to buy their publications.

In general, then, the economic health of all magazines is decided by advertisers. And the health of national consumer magazines is decided to a considerable extent within advertising agencies.

Compared to American magazines, Canadian publications face considerable difficulties. Firstly there is the comparatively limited dollar-size of the Canadian market; and its huge geographic spread adds to the costs of both distribution and editorial coverage. Canada has only a tenth of the population of the United States, and less than a twelfth of its gross national product. Canadian magazines' economic difficulties are further compounded because total Canadian advertising expenditures per dollar of G.N.P. are only sixty percent of those of the U.S. In addition — and the additional difficulties of Canadian magazine publishing go on almost indefinitely — the average Canadian reads only two-thirds the number of magazines that his American neighbour does. And then, a major competitor for national



advertising dollars — the CBC national television network — is heavily state-subsidized, whereas magazines not only receive no direct government support — presumably they would refuse it — but have recently taken a hammering from Ottawa through increased postal rates.

Thus, even when a Canadian magazine is genuinely successful in terms of public appeal, it still finds it difficult to make a substantial amount of money. And the surviving magazines do seem to have public appeal. *Chatelaine's* combined French and English circrculation of 1,250,000 is, on a per-head basis, immensely larger than that of any American woman's magazine. *Star Weekly* (which has, to all intents and purposes, expired; it still exists as a name on a package of newsstand material which includes *The Canadian*) was enormously successful on the newsstands right up to the end — and even in its new form sells 450,000 copies a week. (For circulation figures, see Appendix II.)

So reader acceptance — presumably a proof of the skills of a magazine's editors, writers, and artists — does not guarantee success in Canada. Success can come only when national advertisers feel there is some advantage in spending considerable money in that magazine.

There are difficulties in comparing the advertising revenue attracted by Canadian magazines in 1968 to, say that of 1958. Figures for 1958 cover the receipts of thirteen magazines; 1968 figures cover the receipts of only ten. After 1958, seven magazines were taken off the list and four others were added. Departed: *La Revue Populaire*, *Le Samedi*, *Liberty*, *Canadian Home Journal*, *Canadian Homes*, *La Revue Moderne*, *Mayfair*. Arrived: *Le Magazine Maclean*, *Châtelaine* (French), *Miss Chatelaine* and *The Observer*.

But, in 1958, 1963 and 1968, seven classifications of advertisers provided two-thirds of the revenue of the main magazines. The big seven are: automotive; drugs and toiletries; household furnishings and entertainment equipment; financial and insurance; food and food products; travel and hotels; and alcoholic beverages. As most magazines are only marginally, if at all, profitable, if any one of these groups decided to pull out of magazines completely, it could have disastrous effects. And, with a few exceptions such as food products in *Saturday Night* and alcoholic beverages in *Miss Chatelaine*, each category is important to each magazine.

In 1958, *Maclean's* won more advertising dollars than any other magazine in Canada. In 1963, the two editions of *The Reader's Digest* won more advertising dollars than any other magazine. In 1968, *Time* won the most advertising dollars. The winner in each year most successfully wooed the major advertising categories:

Leader in Advertising Dollars in Main Classifications			
	1958	1963	1968
Auto . . . . .	<i>Maclean's</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Time</i>
Drug . . . . .	<i>Digest</i>	<i>Digest</i>	<i>Chatelaine</i>
Household . . . . .	<i>Maclean's</i>	<i>Digest</i>	<i>Chatelaine</i>
Finance . . . . .	<i>Maclean's</i>	<i>Digest</i>	<i>Time</i>
Food . . . . .	<i>Digest</i>	<i>Chatelaine</i>	<i>Chatelaine</i>
Travel . . . . .	<i>Time</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Time</i>
Alcohol . . . . .	<i>Maclean's</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Time</i>
Total . . . . .	<i>Maclean's</i>	<i>Digest</i>	<i>Time</i>

In all three years studied, food advertisers have been the most important single group to *Chatelaine*. To both *Time* and *Maclean's*, alcoholic beverages have been the most important single group. To *The Reader's Digest*, alcoholic beverages were most important in 1958, drug products in 1963, food products in 1968. In 1968, alcoholic beverages accounted for 24% of the gross advertising revenues of *Saturday Night*.

In total for the three years, alcoholic beverages contributed \$10.3 million to the magazines covered by M.A.B. statistics; food products, \$7.4 million; and drug products, \$6 million.

Presumably, one reason that liquor companies advertise heavily in magazines is that they cannot advertise on TV. And one reason for the somewhat anemic state of Canadian magazines recently is that liquor advertising in magazines declined 24% during the ten-year period.

Under the various liquor board regulations, these A.B.C.-audited "consumer" magazines are considered to be "published" in the province of their head office. Liquor companies, therefore, can design advertising to meet the regulations of either the Quebec or the Ontario board and place them in these publications. *Weekend* and *The Canadian*, however, are considered to be "published" in the provinces of each of the newspapers which carry one or the other. This makes it uneconomical and virtually impossible for liquor companies to advertise in *Weekend* or *The Canadian*, because each provincial board has different requirements. This is one apparent reason for the continuing difficulties of *The Canadian*.

Advertisers frequently assess the comparative selling power of a magazine on the basis of its cost per thousand readers for one page of black-and-white advertising. This cost-per-thousand (C.P.M.) tends to be considerably higher in Canadian magazines than in American magazines. The cost-per-thousand of *Time's* Canadian edition, for example, is \$9.14; the C.P.M. of its American edition is only \$5.45. The C.P.M. of Canadian controlled-circulation magazines is claimed to be closer to that of American counterparts.

## SPECIAL INTEREST V. GENERAL INTEREST

In general, magazines directed at the broadest possible audience have been experiencing the greatest difficulties in recent years; those appealing to more specialized interests tend to do better. Most-quoted success story is that of *Playboy*, which allegedly appeals to young, affluent, city-dwelling males.

In the United States, *Life* and *Look*, both general-appeal magazines, were down in advertising pages in 1968, but *Field and Stream*, *Outdoor Life*, *Rudder* and *Yachting* were all Up. *Ski* magazine in 1968 had its biggest year in the past thirty-three; *Scientific Research* had a forty-one page increase; *Promenade*, *Sports Illustrated*, *Playbill*, *TV Guide*, and *The Rotarian* were all up substantially. *Saturday Review* commented on the magazine scene:

All this confirms what historians and analysts of the business have been noting for some time: that in a country with a population of more than 200 million, producing successful mass magazines has become increasingly difficult, while those reaching smaller audiences within the mass have been increasingly

successful. Since specialization has become profitable and appears to many to be the way of the future, it is hardly surprising that in 1968 new magazines reflected the trend.

In the neighbouring market of only twenty-one million the trend seems to be similar. New Canadian magazines which have been launched or are being discussed are almost all aimed at a specialized audience. Even large-scale new publications can be quite specialized. *Miss Chatelaine*, launched five years ago, reaches 120,000 teenaged girls. *Saturday Night* actively solicits subscribers only from select groups of people and thus tries to get the best of two worlds — paid and controlled circulation (see next section). Arnold Edinborough explained his editorial formula:

I was convinced when I bought *Saturday Night* [price: its bill at the printers] that a magazine with a coherent concept of what it was doing to create an audience could, in fact, create that audience. *Saturday Evening Post* and *Maclean's* had both lost that idea of the audience they were trying to create.

I wanted it well-written, to cover a wide range of topics that could be made to seem of immediate interest to the people the magazine was aimed at, with bitchy hard writing that stirs things up.

His target was to achieve 100,000 subscribers within five years, and he met that target. However, "you have to build circulation very carefully; otherwise, you get too many readers who are not useful to you." So *Saturday Night* actively solicits subscriptions only from certain groups of people.

## FREE V. PAID CIRCULATION

There is serious disagreement in the publishing trade about the best way to get magazines to readers. Should they be sold, given away, or distributed as part of another medium? Or tacked on to club membership fees?

In the past, major magazines have generally been sold to readers, although not necessarily at a profit. Generally such publications are known as "ABC magazines" because their publishers usually belong to the Audit Bureau of Circulations. In Canada today, *Time*, the two *Reader's Digests*, the three *Chatelaines*, the two *Maclean's*, *Saturday Night*, the *United Church Observer*, *Actualité*, and many others are A.B.C. members. On the other hand, Canada's two largest-circulation magazines — *Weekend Magazine/Perspective* (nearly three million copies) and *The Canadian* (two million) — are distributed as supplements to sixty Saturday newspapers.

Serious attempts to launch new national magazines (*Homemaker's Digest*) and new local magazines (*Toronto Calendar*) are based on "controlled circulation" — the publication is sent, free and unrequested, to a specific group of people calculated to comprise a valuable audience for a specific group of advertisers.

In general, A.B.C. publications can be considered The Establishment of Canadian magazines, and A.B.C. publishers scoff at the other two means of getting magazines to readers. R. A. McEachern, Executive Vice-President of Maclean-Hunter, dubs weekend supplements "newspaper stuffers" (even though his own company's new *Financial Post Magazine* will be distributed as a monthly supplement to the weekly business newspaper). "Nobody buys supplements," the paid circulation enthusiasts



point out. "One could disappear tomorrow and wouldn't even be missed." They argue that A.B.C. magazines, because they have to be sold, have higher quality and longer life. "It takes a lot more money to produce a page in one of our books than in one of theirs," they claim.

Not surprisingly, the weekend supplement executives disagree. Ed Mannion, publisher of *The Canadian*, declares that his magazine, even though it is losing money, still spends more than a million dollars a year on its editorial content because, he believes, only a quality publication can survive.

The Canadian A.B.C. members say that paid circulation has gained strength since the days of the O'Leary Commission; that because of increased reader acceptance, it is not so costly now to sell magazine subscriptions, and they point to increased newsstand sales as an indication of growing reader acceptance, *Chatelaine* sells 70,000 English copies a month on newsstands and 15,000 French. *Le Magazine Maclean* sells about 9,000 of its 175,000 circulation copies on newsstands. *Saturday Night* sells between 6,500 and 12,000 copies on the stands. (Newsstand sales are affected significantly by a magazine's cover. A picture of P.E. Trudeau brought *Saturday Night* its biggest sales so far.)

A.B.C. magazines argue that the circulation of supplements has no relationship to their appeal. When Maclean-Hunter published *Canadian Homes* as an A.B.C. magazine, it sold only 125,000 copies an issue. Now it is produced at — according to a Maclean-Hunter executive's guess — "a fraction of the cost," and distributed to two million readers. "How can they possibly claim those two million people are interested when only 125,000 would buy it before?"

Arguments notwithstanding, over the past few years *Weekend Magazine/ Perspectives* has been able to attract large advertising campaigns that might otherwise have gone to A.B.C. magazines. Nevertheless the real battle of the future will likely be fought between A.B.C. magazines and the exponents of "controlled circulation."

This controlled-circulation approach is not new. Most trade papers are distributed this way. But in the area of mass distribution in the past, controlled circulation has often indicated merely junk mail. Two developments have altered that:

The cost of selling magazine subscriptions has skyrocketed over the years. The O'Leary Commission learned that Maclean-Hunter was spending a million dollars a year more to promote the subscription sales of its consumer magazines than it was receiving in subscription revenues. It tended, in other words, to spend \$5 to sell a \$4 subscription. (But Maclean-Hunter executives now claim to be at least breaking even on subscription sales.)

The arrival of the computer enables the "give-away" magazine to be much more precise in creating and controlling the particular list of people to whom it wants to send its magazines. Coupled with this comes the gradual recognition by advertising agencies that computers can help them make media purchase decisions. Eventually even magazines that are sold rather than distributed free, will find it better to provide advertisers with proof of circulation by means of computer feed-out of circulation lists rather than by A.B.C. audit.

In addition, advertisers and agencies are becoming increasingly sophisticated in their techniques of assessing magazine audiences as good advertising prospects.

Instead of reckoning value only in cost-per-thousand-readers, they now also study audience "demographics": age, location, income, buying habits. Emerging also is an interest in "psychographics": an audience's likelihood of behaving in a certain way. Gary Zivot of *Toronto Calendar* "pitches" advertisers about "our group," the audience selected to receive *Toronto Calendar*. "Our group," he claims, "does six times as much travel as other Torontonians. Because it is interested in all the other things to do in Toronto, it watches less television. Therefore *Toronto Calendar* can get to the people who don't watch television." And so on.

In the United States, controlled circulation magazines are still having their troubles. *On View*, a glossy general-interest magazine mailed to 1.7 million Bank Americard holders, disappeared after a couple of issues. The American version of *Homemaker's Digest* also lasted only five issues. Other American newcomers include *Girl Talk*, distributed only through beauty salons in upper-income areas; *Gap* for parents who can afford to send their children to top private colleges; *Quest* (no relation to the Canadian *Quest*), which goes to affluent family men interested in travel, food, leisure. *Here's Charlie* is distributed to teenage charge-account customers of one major department store in each of fourteen cities.

*Homemaker's Digest*, a serious attempt to create a new Canadian women's magazine distributed by controlled circulation, appeared to get off to a rousing start in October, 1966. Its youthful owners, Gordon Badger and Randall Munger, soon launched foreign versions of it in the United States, Britain, and Germany. For a while they could claim that their *Homemaker's Digest* had an international circulation second only to that of *The Reader's Digest*.

But they apparently moved too far too fast. They made bad business decisions in the United States and had to sell off 80% of their interest in that edition. Soon after, they also lost control of the Canadian edition.

In Canada they lost money for longer than they had anticipated because, says Badger:

Advertisers are a lot slower to catch on the new idea than he had expected;

Any new magazine has to prove its financial stability before advertisers will get involved;

A new magazine also has to consistently provide the correct environment for advertising; and

Other magazines make it as tough as they can for a newcomer to nudge in. (In the United States, he notes, *Ladies Home Journal* co-operated with *Homemaker's Digest*. In Canada, *Chatelaine* would not co-operate and instead, produced a controlled circulation magazine of its own, *Hostess*, which grossed \$200,000 in its first year and was predicting \$650,000 for its second year; but it fell as a casualty of the new postal rates.)

The new postal rates would have eventually wiped out *Homemaker's Digest* in Canada had the magazine not created its own delivery system.

As Badger sees it, a controlled circulation magazine has to work even harder than an A.B.C. magazine to win its audience's attention and approval. It has to keep commissioning surveys to prove to advertisers that it is, in fact, being read; and if its ratings drop, its advertising revenues quickly drop too. He has figures that seem to show that *Homemaker's Digest* advertising content attracts more readership than

that of *Chatelaine*, *The Reader's Digest*, *The Canadian*, or *Weekend*. A controlled circulation magazine, he declares, can aim its editorial content directly at its carefully selected readers, whereas ABC magazines have to appeal over a broader interest range—single/married, urban/rural, etc.

*Toronto Calendar* is a single-market, controlled circulation magazine that is distributed to 85,000 homes and 35,000 "luxury" apartments. Publisher Richard Ballentine says he had little trouble getting advertising agencies to accept the approach but that advertisers proved rather more cautious. "Agency men were aware of the money behind us," he says. "They knew we weren't just a couple of guys walking around with a briefcase."

## COSTS OF LAUNCHING NEW MAGAZINES

It seems to be accepted in the trade that to create a new mass circulation (one million copies or more) magazine that is sold rather than given to readers would cost at least \$10 million (and probably even then not have much chance of succeeding). *Maclean's* despite all its years of entrenchment since 1905, and its genuine prestige (every one of the Members of Parliament we surveyed reads *Maclean's*), historically loses money more often than it makes any. And *Chatelaine*, a highly professional publication that seems to be fat with advertising, makes only modest profits on its annual \$6 million to \$8 million gross. It seems unlikely then that commercial motives will attract any newcomers to the field.

Creating a national magazine to be distributed by controlled circulation is less costly. *Homemaker's Digest* cost about \$1 million for its Canadian edition before reaching a break-even point—and then the new postal regulations boosted its overheads an additional \$300,000 a year.

In planning *This City*, a magazine intended to be sold to Torontonians only, Peter Gzowski estimated he would need \$400,000—and some people believed that was too little.

Again in one-city magazines, controlled circulation seems to come in cheaper. *Toronto Calendar* cost about \$300,000 by the time it reached its operating break-even point at the end of 1969.

Gordon Badger, from his experience with *Homemaker's Digest*, believes that "if anyone tried to launch a new paid-circulation national magazine and had the best launching campaign possible, he could only hope to get 100,000 to 200,000 circulation." And in terms of national, mass appeal such figures just don't interest advertisers. "These days," he says, "you have to have either selectivity or mass." And mass in Canada means close to a million. "The government will have to look at controlled circulation more closely if it wants to foster a magazine industry here," he declares. "You just cannot start a new mass magazine now unless it is controlled circulation."

Ed Mannion, publisher of *The Canadian*, says much the same thing: "There's damn' near no hope of anyone starting a new national magazine now—there are just too many things working against you." The industry as a whole is surviving at the moment by dint of the fact that while the number of dollars going into magazine



advertising stays fairly constant, the number of magazines sharing that revenue has decreased.

Things are tough. Lloyd Hodgkinson, publisher of *Chatelaine*, says: "It's a matter of just keeping going." R. A. McEachern, higher in the Maclean-Hunter hierarchy, quickly corrects him, saying: "Consumer magazines are profitable, but they are just not as profitable as other forms of publishing."

There seems little hope of the situation changing dramatically for the better. Maclean-Hunter can afford to keep the three *Chatelaines* and two *Maclean's* going because it is a diversified communications company. McEachern notes: "We are not particularly proud of the fact that we are the only big-leaguers in the country. It is not a situation to be desired." To avoid becoming the only publisher of major Canadian consumer magazines, Maclean-Hunter extended genuine assistance to *Saturday Night* in the days after Arnold Edinborough took it over.

It is possible, then—unless some new techniques of supporting and/or distributing magazines emerge—that Canada now has all the major magazines it is ever going to have.

### WHO OWNS THE MAIN MAGAZINES?

Most consumer magazines of any size or significance in Canada survive because they have other means of support. The three *Chatelaines* and two *Maclean's* are published by the Maclean-Hunter organization, a public company in which Donald Hunter holds 53% of the stock. The *United Church Observer* has both a church and a church publishing house behind it. The Canadian edition of *Time* can draw on the business, financial, and editorial resources of an American parent organization. So can both the French- and English-language Canadian editions of *Reader's Digest*. *Weekend Magazine* is published by The Montreal Standard Publishing Company and so too, to all intents and purposes, is its sister magazine *Perspectives*. (*Weekend* is published by Standard under contract to *Weekend's* thirty nine member newspapers who share in any profits or losses. *Perspectives*, published by Perspectives Inc., owned by its seven member newspapers, contracts with Montreal Standard to publish the magazine.) *The Canadian*, *Canadian Homes* and the *Canadian/Star Weekly* are published by Southstar Publishers Ltd., a consortium of the Toronto *Star* and Southam. The new owners of *Actualité* (they bought it in 1969 when it seemed about to go bankrupt) are Drummond Business Forms, Canada's third largest printing firm which is diversifying into other forms of publishing.

Only other magazines to meet four of the six criteria for inclusion in this paper's "short list" (see appendix) are: *Canadian Churchman* which is the official organ of the Anglican Church; *Legion*, which has the resources of the Royal Canadian Legion behind it; and *Le Petit Journal*, *Dimanche Matin*, and *Photo Journal*, which are closer to being weekly newspapers than magazines in the usual sense. Which leaves only *Saturday Night* as a Canadian consumer magazine of significance trying to stand on its own feet (and even Saturday Night Publications found it necessary to launch a trade paper to help spread company overheads).

Other magazines mentioned in this Report: *Toronto Life* is now owned by the Sifton interests which are, of course, heavily involved in other media. *Toronto*

*Calendar* is owned by Lakemar Ltd., a Ballentine family company; among other directors with a minority interest is Frank Nash of All Canada Radio and Television. Real estate man David Owen helped Peter Gzowski in his efforts to launch *This City*. Controlling interest in *Homemaker's Digest* was acquired in 1969 by Donald Smith and John Norris of Toronto. Southam Press Ltd., a participant in the original company, retains a 10% interest.

Most magazines and trade papers in Canada belong to companies which publish other things as well. Sixty-eight Canadian publishers put out two or more periodicals. In some cases the "two" are merely a monthly and an annual directory covering the same field. However fifty-nine are genuinely "group publishers" and between them they account for forty-one publications listed as "consumer magazines" or "weekend supplements" by *Canadian Advertising Rates and Data*.

But not all publishers of trade papers get into consumer magazines. National Business Publications of Montreal publishes ten trade papers and four directories, but has no consumer magazines. The company once considered entering this field but, according to A. W. Dancy, president: "We thought we'd be taken to the cleaners too fast! Our base of trade papers just was not big enough."<sup>2</sup>

### WHY STAY IN SUCH A TOUGH BUSINESS?

As most major Canadian magazines either lose money or make marginal profits only, one might wonder what motives prompt their publishers.

Floyd Chalmers, former long-time president of Maclean-Hunter, talks rather grandly—and presumably sincerely—of the role that a *Maclean's*, French and English, can play in creating a Canadian awareness. And R.A. McEachern of the same company declares: "We spend more money than we should because we think these magazines are important to the country. We think they have a useful social purpose in Canada. And Donald Hunter hasn't yet cried, 'Halt'."

But the existence of *Maclean's* also adds a prestige to the organization which can be helpful when salesmen are promoting the interests of the Maclean-Hunter trade papers, or when the company applies for a broadcasting licence.

Ed Mannion, publisher of *The Canadian*, *Canadian Homes*, and *The Canadian/Star Weekly*, is proud that his publication carries mainly positive stories, almost totally about Canadians, and most of which he believes would otherwise be unpublished. He also believes this serves a national purpose. On the other hand, newspapers which have to compete for Saturday circulation with others carrying *Weekend Magazine* probably feel the commercial need to carry a magazine supplement of their own (and many but not all, charge five cents extra for their Saturday edition).

Beland Honderich, whose Toronto Star Ltd. helps carry *The Canadian's* losses, believes that national print media are necessary in developing a national awareness or point of view, and that they must be written and edited by Canadians. He says he feels as strongly now as he did when he appeared before the O'Leary

<sup>2</sup> Since this report was written, National Business Publications has been purchased by Southam Press Ltd.

Commission that *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* compete unfairly with Canadian publications. He believes also that unless *The Canadian* and *Weekend/Perspectives* somehow get together to present a united sales front,<sup>3</sup> and/or unless some restriction is placed on *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* there will be no national weekend supplements in existence in Canada in ten years. "We still hope we can make some money out of *The Canadian*," he declares. "We are, after all, in business to make money. However, in addition to being a businessman, you get publishing in your blood and we do feel the need of a national Canadian magazine."

## TIME AND THE READER'S DIGEST

Whether *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* should be allowed to do business in Canada without special restriction was argued long and passionately before the O'Leary Commission. The Commission decided that restrictions should be placed in Canada on the local editions and split-run advertising deals of all American publications. But the government exempted from the resulting legislation both *Time* (now in its 27th year in Canada) and *The Reader's Digest* (now in its 28th).

Since then, both publications appear to have consciously worked to become "good corporate citizens." *The Reader's Digest* has sold stock to Canadians—the only *Digest* subsidiary to do so. *Time* has four or more pages of Canadian news every week. The Canadian edition and many foreign editions of *The Reader's Digest* use primarily Canadian paper. Between five and ten percent of the material appearing in the Canadian edition of *The Reader's Digest* is by and/or about Canadians, and the magazine maintains almost as large a Canadian editorial staff as does *Maclean's*. Their Canadian stories are fed into the international editorial pool and, on the average, 80% of other *Digest* editions pick them up resulting in enormous international readership. The *Digest's* Paul Zimmerman insists that his company exceeded all of Robert Winters' guidelines for good corporate citizenship before they were issued.

Many of the magazines that so stridently opposed the two Americans in appearances before the O'Leary Commission are better disposed to them these days. "Their existence here today," says Lloyd Hodgkinson of *Chatelaine*, "is a constructive element. Without them there would not be enough Canadian publications to make a good 'magazine buy' for advertisers." In other words it can be debated whether *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* take advertising dollars away from Canadian magazines or help to develop a larger total magazine advertising market in which they can all share. *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* jointly take more than half the market. But now both French and English *Maclean's*, *Miss Chatelaine*, *Saturday Night*, and *The Observer* have the same page size as *Time*. Consequently when an advertiser has paid all the unavoidable production costs to place an advertisement in *Time* it becomes comparatively less costly to add some of the other magazines to his schedule as well.

---

<sup>3</sup> This was done in 1969 when the two publications merged their advertising sales organizations in a new company, MagnaMedia Ltd.



Presumably an extra factor in making Canadian magazines less hostile towards their American in-laws is that both were activists in getting the Magazine Advertising Bureau established and both are heavy financial supporters of it. The more successful the Bureau is, the more successful, presumably, its individual members will be. So in general, M.A.B. members no longer complain about the American subsidiaries.

Weekend supplements, (not M.A.B. members), however are still critical of the American presence in Canadian publishing. Beland Honderich points out that local editions of *Time* now compete with newspapers, and he suggests that such competition may delay or prevent the introduction of the local weekend supplements which are now appearing in American newspapers. He has no doubts that the *Time/Digest* presence was one factor that killed *Star Weekly*. Even though *Star Weekly* was selling 900,000 copies a week on newsstands—which indicates it was comparatively more popular than any publication in the United States—it did not win the same popularity from advertisers. He compares *Star Weekly* to a Chevrolet and *The Reader's Digest* to a Cadillac. For the same money, Canadian advertisers preferred to advertise with the "Cadillac," with its high-quality, extremely costly editorial content "dumped" into this country after having being paid for in the United States.

So the same economic dilemmas apply now as when the Royal Commission pondered them. *Time* goes into 185 countries every week. *The Reader's Digest*, published every month in thirty editions in fourteen languages for readers in more than 100 countries, is by far the largest magazine in the world. Its global circulation exceeds twenty-six million copies a month. With the additional factor of readers-per-copy, the *Digest* can claim close to ninety million readers a month. As the majority of the editorial material which appears in the *Digest's* Canadian edition appears also in the other editions, they can all help absorb the cost. For this reason the *Digest* can pay a Canadian writer \$2,000 to develop an original article whereas *Maclean's* and *Chatelaine* pay in the \$400 to \$700 range; *Saturday Night* about \$200 to \$300; *Actualité* about the same; *The Observer* considerably less.

Even though *The Reader's Digest's* profits in Canada took a battering from the postal increases (which boosted its costs by \$600,000), in general the two magazines go from strength to strength. This is hardly surprising: they are, after all, probably the most technically skilful mass magazines in history. The company's skills in the various fields of commercial communications are overwhelming.

Every publishing project handled by the *Digest* assumes a huge volume. A year after the National Film Board and the Queen's Printer and McClelland and Stewart all brought out ambitious and highly illustrated books to celebrate the Canadian Centennial, *The Reader's Digest* published *Canada, This Land, This People* (its first Canadian original) and outsold them all. It was followed by *Canada's Second World War* in three volumes and a three-volume cookbook by Madame Benoit. Where most hard-covered books in Canada sell 3,000 to 10,000 copies, *The Reader's Digest* is not interested in starting a book project unless it is convinced it will sell several times that number. Through its carefully-built mailing list the company does business with about 40% of the nation's five million families every year. After it used its mailing list to sell long-playing musical records, it became the biggest Canadian customer of the RCA recording company.

*Time* in Canada has prospered since the O'Leary Report. President Stephen LaRue reports: "There is no flak at all from advertising agencies. In fact, our being American seems to attract them. The agencies disliked the nationalism furore that went on at the time of the Royal Commission." *Time's* 1963 circulation was 250,000; it expects to reach 500,000 in 1971. Even in Quebec, *Time* is the biggest competitor of *Le Magazine Maclean*, most of whose readers are bilingual. Its advertising revenue was \$2.6 million in 1953, \$8.1 million in 1968.

If O'Leary-style legislation was passed to stop dollars flowing into *Time* and *The Reader's Digest*, there seems even now no way of telling whether those dollars would be diverted into other existing Canadian A.B.C. magazines; into existing weekend supplements; into helping launch new magazines or supplements; into other advertising media altogether; or right out of advertising and into non-media sales promotion. But it does seem likely that without the advertising revenue neither magazine would stay around for long.

## THE MAGAZINE ADVERTISING BUREAU

Before deciding to implement or ignore the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Publications, successive governments waited to see whether the protagonists (basically *Time* and *Reader's Digest* on the one side and *Maclean-Hunter* on the other—both sides preferring to act as if weekend supplements were mere intruders) could agree on some compromise. While waiting, the revenue of all Canadian magazines declined because of advertisers' uncertainty. Eventually legislation was brought down which allowed *Time* and *The Digest* to continue operating in Canada.

At this stage the leading "consumer magazines," spearheaded by the Americans, decided they must create a unified front to present the Canadian magazine story to advertisers. As membership in the existing associations was restricted to "Canadian" magazines, some new organization was necessary. It was decided to extract the statistics-gathering section of the Periodical Press Association and use that as the base of a Magazine Advertising Bureau which the Americans would be eligible to join. The M.A.B. is essentially a sales promotion agency, but its functions seem to be expanding, and it seems that it will eventually become, to all intents and purposes, a "trade association" for so-called consumer magazines.

Just as the Periodical Press Association and the Magazine Publishers Association carefully excluded American owned publications from membership, so does the comparatively new M.A.B. exclude weekend supplements and controlled circulation magazines. Its members seem to be trying to protect the use of the word "magazine"; they imply that it can only be rightly applied to publications sold directly to the public and not to those distributed by other means.

M.A.B. membership comprises *Time*, *The Reader's Digest* (French and English editions), three *Chatelaines*, two *Maclean's*, *The Observer*, *Actualité*, and *Saturday Night*. Their circulations total 4,618,000—85% of the circulation of Canadian A.B.C. consumer magazines, but slightly less than the combined circulations of *Weekend/Perspectives* and *The Canadian*.

Section 3.06 of the M.A.B.'s constitution determines which publications may apply for membership:

The board of directors, upon the application of a Member, may designate any magazine published by the Member as a Member Magazine. The magazine in respect of which the Member seeks designation as a Member Magazine must meet the following requirements:

- (a) Such magazine must have been published regularly during the twelve months preceding application for designation as a Member Magazine.
- (b) Such magazine shall be published not less than four times annually and shall not be issued in the form of or as an adjunct to a newspaper. Its principal source of readers shall be paid subscribers.
- (c) Such magazine must at the time of the application of the Member for such designation and thereafter as a condition to remaining designated as a Member Magazine, be subject to audit by the Audit Bureau of Circulations.
- (d) Such magazine shall at the time of such application by the Member and thereafter derive a significant portion of its actual gross advertising revenue from national advertising.
- (e) The Member and the magazine in respect of which such Member seeks such designation must endorse and adhere to the Canadian Code of Advertising Standards of the Canadian Advertising Advisory Board.

The M.A.B.'S rigid restriction of membership implies a special status attached to the description "magazine." If so, and if they are able to protect it, then there are disadvantages for those excluded from membership. Certainly *Weekend* and *The Canadian* would like to be automatically considered when an advertiser wonders: "Which magazines, if any, shall I advertise in? :

Beland Honderich comments:

I suppose one would like all the advantages one could get to survive. We [*Star Weekly*] tried to get into the M.A.B. once. We would like to be members in order to build recognition in the minds of advertisers that we are, in fact, a magazine and would therefore automatically be considered for magazine advertising schedules.

*Time's* Stephen LaRue says: "The membership requirements are there to let us control the membership. We want new members who can add to the mix."

M.A.B. magazines attracted 446 new advertisers into their pages in 1968, for a total of 939. The Bureau's budget that year was \$200,000 which included a special \$80,000 levy for a big research project. The results of that project caused a storm of controversy because the results were very unflattering to the weekend magazines, and especially to *The Canadian*. It indicated that M.A.B. member publications had average readerships ranging from 2.8 per copy (*Chatelaine*) to 5.9 (*Saturday Night*). *Weekend* had only 2.1 readers and *The Canadian*, 1.5. Qualifications for M.A.B. membership seem to rule out all the main new developments in publishing — single-market magazines, newspaper supplements, controlled circulation. However the M.A.B.'s president, John S. Crosbie, says that the single-market magazine *Toronto Life* now carries enough national advertising to qualify for membership if only its circulation were audited by A.B.C. (*Toronto Life's* publisher, Michael Sifton, on the other hand, says he is not sure that he would want to join anyway: he is not sure whether he wants his publication to be known as "a magazine.") Crosbie also says *The Atlantic Advocate* would probably be welcome too if it were a member of A.B.C. At the same time, he implies that magazines are only likely to be accepted for membership if their editorial standards are considered by the board of directors to be "high enough" to satisfy the rest of the members.



## MAGAZINES IN QUEBEC

About the only French-language magazines in Quebec that seem to come within the scope of this paper are the French-language counterparts of *Maclean's* (*Le Magazine Maclean*), *Chatelaine* (*Châtelaine*), *Reader's Digest* (*Selection du Reader's Digest*) and *Weekend* (*Perspectives*). Only one French-language monthly is not connected with an English-language counterpart: *Actualité*. The French-language news weekly *Sept Jours* has been in continuous difficulty and was published irregularly in 1970. The Quebec market has numerous weekend tabloid newspapers sold primarily on newsstands. They do not attract much national advertising. Recently there have been moves to consolidate a number of these under a couple of corporate roofs.

*Le Magazine Maclean* carries content quite different from that of *Maclean's*. This fact somewhat saddens Floyd Chalmers who had anticipated more cross-fertilization between the two. Both magazines invariably buy full national rights to their articles in case their counterpart wants to run the story too. But in 1968 only one article appeared in both magazines ("My Friend Richard Nixon," by Joey Smallwood). (*Le Magazine Maclean* pays editorial rates almost as high as those of the English *Maclean's*; It has rather fewer people on staff because fewer of its stories need the national scope of *Maclean's* pieces.)

Well over half the material in *Châtelaine*, on the other hand, is picked up from the English *Chatelaine*. All the "service" material — fashions, foods, beauty, furnishings, etc. — is common to both and *Châtelaine* also often takes articles from English *Chatelaine* and adapts them for Quebec readers. There is less traffic in articles from French to English. Both magazines buy full Canadian rights on all articles but, by the time they pay translation costs, there is no great financial saving in the cross-fertilization.

*Selection du Reader's Digest* has its own editorial team who, like editors of all other editions of the *Digest*, choose material for their edition from a central pool. Much of the translation work has already been done in France.

*Perspectives* and *Weekend* run 40% to 50% common articles. Most such pieces originate in English because *Weekend* has to find stories of national interest whereas *Perspective's* audience is mainly within Quebec.

*Actualité* has grown out of an old magazine that used to be distributed free to 200,000 Catholic families. Launched in 1909, it had a heavily religious aspect until the 1960s, when it became more generally consumer-oriented, joined the Audit Bureau of Circulations, and appointed representatives to pursue national advertising business. In 1964, a television company bought a 51% interest but in January, 1969, when the publication seemed likely to be abandoned, Drummond Business Forms took it over.

Its circulation in June, 1969, was 104,000, and the publishers have their sights set on meeting *Le Magazine Maclean's* 170,000 circulation. It plans to extend its distribution nationally to French-Canadians in the Maritimes and Ontario. The magazine has an editorial staff of three and buys all its material from freelancers to whom it pays \$60 to \$200 a page.

Drummond Business Forms, which bought *Actualité* because it thought the only independent French-language monthly should not be allowed to disappear, is

getting heavily into other forms of publishing. With *Actualité* it also bought *Vie et Carrière*, published ten times a year for 48,000 students. (Its content is divided between youth activities and career information.) The company will probably also get into trade papers and try to pull together many existing independent French-language publications. It is also publishing books and under contract prints seven magazines and three newspapers.

## COMPLAINTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT

Publishers of all magazines aimed at fairly broad audiences have to compete not only with each other, but also with other advertising media. Consequently they nearly all feel that it is unfair for public money to subsidize imported TV programmes which CBC sells to advertisers at less than cost. Advertisers, they declare, rush to spend their limited advertising appropriations on the big American shows carried by CBC because these are, genuinely, a bargain — at the taxpayer's expense. Magazines see this as a form of government discrimination against their own medium and others.

There is real resentment among all magazine publishers (except perhaps those at *Canada Month* who believe the post office should by all means pay its own way) about the effects of sudden, drastic postage rate increases coupled with a decline in postal delivery service. The new rates put the cost of mailing *The Observer*, for example, up \$120,000 in a total budget of \$800,000. "If we didn't have the church and the publishing house behind us, we'd be dead," notes the editor. The new rates increased *Actualité's* postage bill by more than 400% (*Actualité* costs 11¢ to mail; *Playboy* 2½¢). In addition, complain the publishers, the delivery service is so bad that some advertisements are out of date before the magazine reaches its readers. "We had to employ three people just to answer telephone complaints from people who received the magazine on the twentieth instead of on the first," claims Gregoire Ewing, of Drummond Business Forms. He wonders what will happen when *Actualité* starts to sell to the French-speaking subscribers across the country.

If the A.B.C. magazines took a drubbing, the mass appeal controlled circulation publications were almost knocked out of business. (Controlled circulation trade papers, for some reason, were treated more leniently.) One, in fact, did quickly disappear. In 1968 *Chatelaine* had launched *Hostess*, a controlled circulation magazine to complement *Chatelaine's* own paid circulation. Where *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* pay 2½¢ postage under the new rates, *Hostess* would have had to pay 4¢ or 7¢ depending on the size of the issue. That is 100% more on a per-piece basis and 500% more on weight, declared the publishers, who promptly abandoned the magazine.

*Homemaker's Digest*, after a million dollar investment, had just about reached a break-even stage when the new rates were established pushing its mailing costs from 1¢ to 4¢ minimum. On an annual budget of \$1 million, this represented a postage increase of \$300,000. The magazine had three choices: to go out of business and wave its million dollar investment farewell (as Maclean-Hunter had done with its investments in *Hostess*); to switch to fourth class mail at 2¢ ("But then you lose your viability altogether."); or to set up its own distribution system. It chose the third alternative.

*Toronto Calendar*, another controlled circulation magazine, did not qualify for the new second class mailing privileges, and switched to distribution by Wayne Distributors at a delivery cost in Toronto of 2¢ a piece.

*The Reader's Digest* notes that it is discriminated against in Canada in two ways. It, along with *Time*, was granted exemption from the post-O'Leary Report legislation. However, to retain this special status, it must now remain similar in content and in the class of readers to which it is directed as in the issues of the twelve months ending April 26, 1965. Paul Zimmerman of the *Digest* declares: "We are thus denied the right to meet changing competitive concepts, in format and circulation." *Chatelaine*, for example, competes with *The Reader's Digest* for various types of advertising. When *Chatelaine* launched *Hostess* in an attempt to improve its competitive position, *The Reader's Digest* was unable to counter.

The new postal regulations restrict second-class mailing privileges to "Canadian" newspapers and periodicals. "*The Reader's Digest* and *Sélection du Reader's Digest* do not fall within the Postal Act definition of Canadian periodicals," notes Zimmerman. "Under these circumstances the postage cost of mailing subscribers' copies of *Reader's Digest* and *Sélection du Reader's Digest* can be increased by the Postmaster General without reference to Parliament."

## SHOULD CANADA CARE?

The Royal Commission on Publications declared:

Ideally, periodical publishing in Canada should be Canadian, competitive and healthy — *Canadian* because of the desirability of information written by Canadians to Canadians; *competitive*, because no one has a monopoly on truth or wisdom, and monopolistic or oligopolistic tendencies inhibit unfettered decision-making and debate; and *healthy*, because general well-being of the industry is valuable both in itself and as a climate in which new publishing ventures would have a chance to survive.

The bulk of material in Canadian magazines — if *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* are excluded — is decidedly *Canadian* because that seems the only way Canadian publishers can win any attention in competition with the American magazines that dominate our newsstands by a factor of ten-to-one or more. They are *competitive* with each other to an extent — although increasingly the competitive lines are being drawn on the basis of A.B.C. magazines *v.* weekend supplements *v.* controlled circulation magazines; and then all three, lumped together as "national print," compete for revenue with newspapers, radio, television, direct mail.

But *healthy* they are not. Only *Time* and *The Reader's Digest* have made money on any consistent basis in the past decade. It is hard to imagine any grand enough change in the immediate future that will make mass magazines in Canada economically robust. Does this matter?

Publishers of national magazines believe that their magazines' existence helps create a national awareness and contributes to the formation of a national point of view. There seems little real evidence either for or against this. It is hard to recall a magazine exposé in recent years that had the same public impact as, say, the CBC's television story on air pollution at Dunnville.



Magazines may be considered valuable in that they usually give a writer more time to work on a story than a newspaper does, and therefore it should have a better chance of being accurate and told in a truer perspective. The magazine writer also has more time to improve the calibre of the writing involved – probably why book publishers have been able to acknowledge that magazines have been the training ground – not to say feeding trough – of many Canadian authors.

Certainly to freelance writers the declining number of magazine outlets can be a handicap, especially now that most *Maclean's* material is staff-written. A shortage of markets soon results in a shortage of freelancers. A *Maclean's* man moaned: "All we seem to see nowadays is guys with jobs, or housewives, or college kids." On the other hand, as print declines, broadcasting grows, and presumably it is up to the writer to aim his efforts at the markets that do exist.

In Canada, however, there are worrying aspects in any general move of writers from print to broadcast. The *Maclean's* staff man noted: "If I get brassed off with my boss, where can I go for a job at my level?" The only place he could think of going was to the CBC, and certainly the Corporation is the major employer of talent of his type in Canada these days. But such a migration from print to broadcast also means in Canada a migration of professional communicators from private enterprise to public enterprise, a matter which should surely be given some thought. Canadians may indeed decide to accept a predominantly state-supported culture, but the decision should presumably not be made by default. The *Maclean's* editor said sombrely: "Most of us feel really trapped."

National magazines play, unintentionally, an external-relations role for Canada too. Until a few years ago, sunbathers on a beach in New Zealand could – and did – buy copies of *Star Weekly* at their local newsstand. *Saturday Night* magazine has a number of paid subscriptions from Americans who have browsed through a copy of the magazine on an Air Canada flight. It is ironic that the greatest exposure of magazine stories overseas about Canada may be through the pages of *The Reader's Digest*.

Without the existence of commercially supported national magazines, the government may eventually be tempted to create one of its own to spread the Canadian word abroad. A provincial example of such a magazine has recently been seen in *Alberta, A Land for Living* published by the Alberta government. Significantly the first forty-eight page issue carried five pages of photographs of members of the cabinet.

## CONTENT AND IMPACT

### WHO DECIDES WHAT GOES INTO A MAGAZINE?

"Life," according to a pronouncement by *The Reader's Digest* to the O'Leary Commission, "is a savoury adventure." The editor of the Canadian edition of the *Digest* had better believe it; because much of the material he selects is expected to reflect that understanding. (*Digest's* Canadian editors are responsible to the editors at the American head office in Pleasantville, not to the head of the Canadian company.)

Few editors, however, have such a clear guideline. Serrell Hillman, until recently chief of *Time's* Toronto bureau, always found it impossible to define a *Time* story. He could only say that staffers over the years get a feel for what creates one. (The editor of *Time's* Canadian pages can be criticized for their content by head office — but only after publication. However all *Time's* Canadian material is sent in advance to the United States for final editing.)

*Maclean's* offers a little bit of something to almost everyone, so its editors look for articles that will create the right "mix." They need some pieces in each issue to carry colour illustrations; some in a light vein; some "think pieces"; and a geographic spread of coverage, if possible. Then they have to juggle these considerations to match the talents of the writers available. Superimposed on top of everything, is the need to be interesting. "We can't take the attitude that we must put something on the record simply because it is important," explained a *Maclean's* man. "We would really like to do something on the Carter report, for example, but how can you make that interesting?" (Magazines do often succeed in making apparently dull subjects interesting, and in this way convey public-service information. But self-consciously educational material published "in the public interest," rather than because "it will interest the public" never yet supported a mass magazine.)

With the exception of such general-interest publications as *The Reader's Digest*, *Time*, *Maclean's*, *Weekend*, *The Canadian*, *Actualité*, most magazines these days pitch their editorial content to appeal to a specific group. *Chatelaine's* target group, women, is sizeable but among all women there is a smaller audience — young married women with children — that the publishers especially want to attract because they spend a lot of money on a lot of things. A proportion of *Chatelaine* editorial material, then, is always selected to appeal to them.

*Saturday Night* wants to attract an audience with a certain level of intelligence and social, political, and economic awareness, so that means its editors cannot run comic strips or kitchen hints. *Toronto Life* wants to get into the hands of Torontonians with disposable income, so its editors select stories they think will capture the attention of such people.

And so it goes. Most mass magazines in Canada use their editorial content in an attempt to create a specific audience to appeal to specific advertisers. Their battle for survival is fought in terms of technique and not message; the battle takes almost all the energies of publishers, editors, writers and advertising managers. In years past, a Colonel J. B. MacLean might indeed sometimes try to influence public or government opinion by issuing a vigorous blast simultaneously through the pages of *Maclean's*, *The Financial Post*, and various trade papers — all of which he personally owned. But today in mass magazines in Canada the professional managers preoccupied with business considerations have taken over from the owner-managers; and polemics and profitability do not often coincide. Probably no mass magazine in Canada can afford permanently to alienate any sizeable group of potential readers.

In the long run, then, commercial demands dictate the content of most Canadian magazines, and it would be a mistake to look in many for a deliberate attempt to promote a particular point of view. Admittedly, *The Observer* does try to hook

some Christian or church angle to the stories it runs. *Chatelaine* is feministic and proud that it ran articles on, say, abortion twenty years before appropriate legislation was passed. Arnold Edinborough felt that *Saturday Night* should continuously "interpret what is new in society and bring up to date the perpetual problems of Canada in a way that stops people getting bored with the things that have to be rethought." But none of that really sounds like hidden persuasion.

Canadian magazines do tend to be nationalistic. *Star Weekly* was deliberately so, and *The Canadian* is too: it prefers to present positive rather than negative aspects of Canada. *Maclean's* founder told its first editor: "The [one feature] that should distinguish *Maclean's* from others is the Canadianism of the original matter. . . . Nearly all letters received from readers show the Canadianism of *Maclean's* appeals to them. This is the strongest feature in the magazine. Make it the guiding principle of your work. Keep it before you every minute." Today Canadian magazines carry Canadian content as the only way to compete with foreign magazines that have no Canadian content.

On the whole, however, magazine publishers are too busy trying to create a product that will, one way or another appeal to advertisers, to spend their energies trying to propagate particular viewpoints, even nationalism.

### THE ADVERTISER'S ROLE

Does it matter that Canadian magazines' survival is so dependent on advertisers' appreciation? If varied enough advertisers want to reach varied enough audiences, and if they believe that magazine advertising is an effective medium, then the system will support a reasonable diversity of magazines. But Canadian magazines are not attracting a great deal of national advertising revenue these days (less than radio, for example), so Canada has few magazines, and most of those that do exist are vulnerable. If an adults' magazine is not selected for liquor company advertising, for example, its economic prospects are bleak.

### IMPORTANCE OF CLIMATE

Magazine editors and publishers are unlikely to let an individual advertiser influence the content of an individual story, but advertisers as a group influence the total editorial climate of a magazine.

"Advertisers are the most conservative people in the world," insists Arnold Edinborough. *Saturday Night* lost one major advertiser when it carried a picture of a nude woman. *Maclean's* lost drug company advertising for a while, after it ran a series of critical pieces on over-medication. In general, however, advertisers are too sophisticated to try to directly influence the editorial content of any major magazine.

But the prosperity, if any, of a magazine will be affected by whether or not its editorial atmosphere appeals to advertisers. The *United Church Observer*, for example, consistently promotes the idea of Christian giving, suggesting that the



haves of this world should always help the have-nots. This atmosphere makes it a poor medium for advertising luxury products and consequently only 25% of its revenue comes from advertising. "I can't enjoy a good cigar while I'm looking at pictures of all those little kids with pot bellies," complained one potential advertiser. "It doesn't put me in a buying mood." The *Observer* is, on the otherhand, very effective for promoting charitable causes. "I suspect in *that* we outdraw *Time*," grins the editor.

The atmosphere created by presenting life as a "savoury adventure" has probably helped attract advertisers to *The Reader's Digest* although, with "sweetness 'n' light" somewhat out of style these days, the Digest recently ran an advertisement in *Marketing* stressing that "... there's nothing square about the Digest. Gutsy, controversial and contemporary subjects are a part of every issue: 'The Pill and the Teen-age Girl,' 'But, Mom, Everybody Smokes Pot,' 'This Stranger, My Son.'"

During one period in the life of *Maclean's*, the magazine ran many exposé-style stories, emphasizing the negative rather than the positive in society. Advertising dropped off drastically. When that editor quit, the incoming editor was left in no doubt that future issues of the magazine must be more cheerful and positive or it was likely to collapse altogether.

An outsider might be startled that content is manipulated to attract a certain type of reader, and style and approach tailored to create an effective advertising environment. The Royal Commissioners of 1960 also found it worthy of comment. The O'Leary Report noted that in magazine publishing, the reader becomes

a product to be sold for the best possible price to the largest number of customers. . . . Magazines vie with each other to prove how near perfection their circulation has become. . . .

Will a large circulation or a smaller influential one bring the publisher the most profit? Should his editorial content be aimed at the lowest intelligence and income brackets? Which will attract the most revenue without itself costing too much to attract and maintain?

Most decisions on the content of major magazines are made on that sort of basis, so it seems unlikely that any major Canadian-owned magazine is deliberately propagating a publisher's viewpoint. (Publishers and editors wanting to get across particular philosophies are more likely to be found among the smaller magazines which try to garner an audience among those who are themselves influential: politicians, academics, senior business executives, other writers and publishers and editors.)

## BAD TASTE AND MY TASTE

Interestingly enough, publishers who say they are reluctant to push their own political viewpoints through the pages of their magazines feel less hesitation in imposing their own ideas of "good taste." Floyd Chalmers can recall only one instance in his fifteen years as president of Maclean-Hunter when he insisted that an item be dropped from *Maclean's*. The reason: He considered it unnecessarily loaded with obscenity. Michael Sifton likewise acknowledges that he blue-pencils vulgari-

ties in *Toronto Life* when he feels they contribute nothing to the article in question. All of which is understandable and may even be commendable. But it is worth observing that language and presentations considered obscene by one generation or one established group are sometimes symbols of attempts to force change by younger or non-established groups. In the broadest sense, there may be more significant "political" implications in not printing four-letter words than in printing political slogans.

## TUG OF WAR

Probably because of the nature of the work and its unspectacular financial rewards, there is a tendency for Canadian writers and editors to be the kind of people who are not primarily motivated by money. For the young man with broad interests, a good education and no inherited money, journalism can offer a fair route into the middle class, but it is no route to meaningful wealth. On the other hand, the \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year offered senior staff writers on Canadian magazines probably has little appeal to sons of well-established families who may be more conscious of the advantages that come with money and property. Magazines, this would imply, are more likely to attract "liberals" than any other medium.

Publishers and advertisers on the other hand have, amongst other things, a more obvious stake in the prosperity of capitalism. By definition, they are owners. They seem more likely to be "conservatives." And tensions inevitably arise. In a couple of cases they have led to a walkout by magazine staffs. In September, 1961, Jack Kent Cooke sold *Saturday Night*, of which Arnold Edinborough was then editor. Edinborough stayed on as editor for about nine months until he decided that his new employers wanted to use the magazine to promote Social Credit ideas. He and most others on the editorial staff quit. "Nobody under sixty stayed," he recalls. (A year later he was able to buy the magazine for the cost of its printing bill.) On another occasion, Ken Lefolli and most of the editorial staff of *Maclean's* quit when a non-editorial executive killed a piece of copy. In 1969, Charles Templeton quit as editor of *Maclean's* citing "harassment" by management.

One staff writer feels that, because Maclean-Hunter is heavily involved in radio and in cable television, the company's magazines do not tackle such topics as frequently as would otherwise be expected. "To that extent," he suggests, "we are too much a part of the business establishment." But there is a feeling among Maclean-Hunter executives that *Maclean's*, with its sixty years as "Canada's national magazine," has become almost a public trust. (There is an unwritten policy that it supports no political party.) If it shows any continuing bias it is probably simply "pro-Canada." This tradition of editorial independence, built over the past decade or so, has been inherited by *Le Magazine Maclean*. Although Floyd Chalmers, then president, had hoped there would be considerable cross-fertilization between the two *Maclean's*, he made no effort to insist that there should be. Nor did anyone interfere when *Le Magazine Maclean* hired an acknowledged separatist as a staff writer.

## LITERARY MAFIA

Because the world of Canadian media is fairly restricted, many of its successful citizens move from one conspicuous role within it to another and are sometimes collectively labelled "the literary mafia." The paths between the outlets for journalistic talent are well trodden by a comparatively small number of feet. An especially well-trodden circuit takes in the CBC, *Maclean's*, the *Toronto Star*, and McClelland and Stewart, the book publishers. Charles Templeton, for example, former editor of *Maclean's*, has worked for both television networks and been an editor of the *Star*. His predecessor at *Maclean's* had also been a *Star* editor. Robert Fulford, editor of *Saturday Night*, has been a *Maclean's* staff man, *Toronto Star* columnist, a McClelland and Stewart author, and is a busy broadcaster on CBC.

So there is a tendency for Canadian media originating in Toronto – and most do originate in Toronto – to offer a somewhat similar flavour of opinion. It tends to be liberal, city-oriented, mildly iconoclastic. In the case of most magazines, publishers and advertisers exercise a counterbalancing effect. When Ken Lefolli and his writers made *Maclean's* too iconoclastic ("Muck-racking," moaned his critics), there were soon conflicts with management and *Maclean's* advertising revenue nosedived.

If magazine economics continue to tighten, presumably editors and writers will be able to bring less weight to this tug of war and owners and advertisers will bring more.

## DO MAGAZINES OFFER BOTH SIDES OF A PICTURE?

The style of magazine journalism has changed in recent years. The "new journalism" most often reflects the writer's intimate involvement in and reaction to what he is describing. Subjective writing is in vogue. Where once an article writer was expected to try to present a rounded or balanced picture of any controversy, this is often no longer the case.

Magazines feel no obligation to give precisely equal space or prominence to both viewpoints in a dispute. Yet good publishing techniques tend to encourage this anyway in the long run. If *Maclean's* runs two or three consecutive profiles of Progressive Conservative politicians, it will soon feel the need to run a story on a Liberal or an N.D.P. man simply to avoid boring the readers. If any particular viewpoint is presented frequently, then a devil's advocate's argument will attract many readers – and the magazine is in business to attract readers.

Magazines do sometimes make more self-conscious attempts to give "equal space." *Maclean's* for many years ran a regular piece, "For the Sake of Argument." But it was often a problem finding articulate people who wanted to express strong and unorthodox viewpoints in this way. Similarly *Weekend* recently launched a regular feature, "Counter-Attack" to let people argue against viewpoints expressed in the magazine. Again it is not proving easy to find contributors.



## DO MAGAZINES LEAD OR REFLECT PUBLIC OPINION?

Most editors say their magazines should be ahead of public opinion. "I think you should be ahead of the pack, an instigator of thinking," says Dr. Forrest of the *Observer*. "I see myself as being in a privileged position. I travel, I can learn things, I can form opinions. The *Observer* opposed capital punishment for years before the church did."

*Chatelaine* is proud that it too has been "ahead of the pack." But a magazine, nevertheless, is paced by a certain speed the public will accept. Why else would the French-language *Châteline* find that it cannot move as fast as the English-language version?

## CONTROLLED-CIRCULATION MAGAZINES

Magazines that arrive unrequested in a Canadian household probably have to be more circumspect, more careful to avoid offending than those actually chosen by the reader. A *Saturday Night* article, for example, recently used the word "fuck," and no doubt it offended some readers who probably cancelled their subscriptions.

But when *Toronto Calendar* ran a forum of letters-to-the-editor on the topic of censorship, one letter received used the same four-letter word. Doubly aware of the irony involved because the debate itself was on "censorship," the editors telephoned the letter-writer to see whether *he* agreed the word should not be used in a magazine that is circulated free. He did agree. *Toronto Calendar* has to be especially careful not to offend people because, by the nature of the way it is distributed, it is not possible to *stop* delivering the magazine to anyone who asks to be left off the list.

To an extent then, controlled-circulation magazines share some of the drawbacks of broadcasting channels. An obvious comparison to draw is that of Kenneth Tynan, who used *That Word* on a television broadcast in Britain. The protest that arose from offended viewers on that occasion was heard round the world.

Perhaps there are similar restrictions on magazines delivered as part of a newspaper. In the same month (September, 1969) that many newspapers refused to carry an issue of *Weekend* with a story on homosexuality, *Saturday Night* had a cover story entitled: "The Homosexual Life in Canada: After the Trudeau Law."

# Appendix I

## Canadian Magazines by Size & Significance:

List includes only magazines that meet four or more of these six criteria.

Magazine	Size Rating			Significance Rating		
	per issue circulation 100,000 or more	annual circulation 1,000,000 or more	b/w page rate \$1000 or more	established 40 years or more	looked into by many MPs	retained by many libraries
<i>Maclean's</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Le Magazine Maclean</i> (F) . . . . .	x	x	x		x	x
<i>Chatelaine</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x	x		x
<i>Reader's Digest</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x		x	x
<i>Time Canada</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x		x	x
<i>Weekend Magazine</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x		x	x
<i>Canadian Churchman</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x	x		x
<i>Saturday Night</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x	x		
<i>Actualité</i> (F) . . . . .	x	x	x	x	x	
<i>Le Petit Journal</i> (F) . . . . .	x	x	x	x		
<i>Legion</i> (E) . . . . .	x	x	x	x		
<i>Photo Journal</i> (F) . . . . .	x	x	x	x		
<i>Sélection du Reader's Digest</i> (F) . . . . .	x	x	x	x	x	
<i>Dimanche Matin</i> (F) . . . . .	x	x	x		x	
<i>Perspectives</i> (F) . . . . .	x	x	x		x	

Magazines that met three of our six criteria: *La Patrie* (F), *Rod & Gun in Canada* (E), *Toronto Calendar* (E), *United Church Observer* (E), *Canadian Motorist* (E), *Canadian High News* (E), *TV Guide* (E), *The Canadian* (E), *Key Map Digest* (E), *Canadian Boy* (E), *Co-operative Consumer* (E), *TV Hebdo* (F), *Toronto Calendar Magazine* (E), *Canadian Homes* (E), *Chatelaine* (F).



## Appendix II

## Canadian Magazines by Per Issue Circulation

Magazine	Per Issue Circulation	Magazine	Per Issue Circulation
<i>Weekend Magazine</i> (E)	2,017,000	<i>Co-operative Consumer</i> (E)	209,000
<i>The Canadian</i> (E)	2,000,000	<i>The Saskatchewan Motorist</i> (E)	188,000
<i>Homemakers Digest</i> (E)	1,100,000	<i>Allo Police</i> (F)	174,000
<i>Madame Au Foyer</i> (F)	1,085,000	<i>Canadian Motorist</i> (E)	167,000
<i>Reader's Digest</i> (E)	1,005,000	<i>Canadian High News</i> (E)	159,000
<i>Key Map Digest</i> (E)	944,000	<i>TV Hebdo</i> (F)	142,000
<i>Châtelaine</i> (E&F)	885,000	<i>La Patrie</i> (F)	138,000
<i>Maclean's</i> (E&F)	759,000	<i>The Alberta Motorist</i> (E)	131,000
<i>TV Guide</i> (E)	473,000	<i>Photo Journal</i> (F)	131,000
<i>Perspectives</i> (F)	410,000	<i>Almanach du Peuple</i> (F)	123,000
<i>Time Canada</i> (E)	323,000	<i>Miss Châtelaine</i> (E)	120,000
<i>The United Church Observer</i> (E)	306,000	<i>Saturday Night</i> (E)	102,000
<i>Canadian Boy</i> (E)	289,000	<i>B.C. Motorist</i> (E)	112,000
<i>Dimanche Matin</i> (F)	286,000	<i>Sports Famille</i> (F)	110,000
<i>Legion</i> (E)	258,625	<i>Actualité</i> (F)	110,000
<i>Globe Magazine</i> (E)	265,000	<i>Échos Vedettes</i> (F)	110,000
<i>Sélection du Reader's Digest</i> (F)	266,000	<i>Quest</i> (E)	107,000
<i>Canadian Churchman</i> (E)	225,000	<i>Nouvelles Illustrées</i> (F)	104,000
<i>Le Petit Journal</i> (F)		<i>Toronto Calendar</i> (E)	120,000

Magazines with circulations between 20,000 and 100,000: *Passport*, *Best Wishes* (E), *Hockey News* (E), *Le Nouveau Samedi* (F), *Télémondmonde* (F), *Sunday Sun* (E), *Dernière Heure* (F), *Le Journal Des Vedettes* (F), *Autoclub* (Bi), *Rod & Gun in Canada* (E), *Hockey Pictorial* (E), *La Semaine* (F), *Canadian Football News* (E), *Photo Vedettes* (F), *Vie et Carrière* (F), *Toronto Life* (E), *What's On in Ottawa* (E), *Know Canada* (E), *Current Events à Montréal* (E), *Golf Canada* (Bi), *Wildlife Crusader* (E), *Country Guide* (E), *Echoes* (E), *The Scout Leader* (E), *B.C. Outdoors* (E), *Blue Water Circle Drives* (E), *Canadian Geographic Journal* (E), *The Atlantic Advocate* (E), *Au Grand Air* (F), *The Cadet Traveller* (E), *Key to Toronto* (E).

## Chapter 3

### THE STUDENT PRESS IN CANADA

Barbara Sullivan

#### INTRODUCTION

The student press in Canada cannot be described as monolithic. Technical proficiency, editorial and news content, and production techniques differ from campus to campus — the singular factor influencing the nature of each publication being the personality, experience, and political and journalistic goals of its editor-in-chief.

On the other hand, the student press across Canada is for the most part a dynamic press, a vibrant press, a press which is readily open to change, new techniques, and “radical” content. It is not a press easily appreciated by a stultified middle class, conditioned by and for the tamer fare of daily and weekly newspapers. It is a press which has become “radicalized” during the decade, and this process has affected, as will be shown, techniques, personnel, content, and direction throughout Canada.

On March 22, 1926, a poem was published by A. J. M. Smith in the *McGill Fortnightly Review*. It asked, and answered:

“Why is The McGill Daily?”  
Asked the pessimist sourly.  
“Thank God,” said the optimist gaily,  
“That it isn’t hourly!”<sup>1</sup>

It is a reasonable to suspect that close to forty-five years later, administrators on most Canadian campuses could express similar sentiments concerning their student publications. For the student press can be, and is, a stubborn dandelion on administrations’ collective green lawns. It is equally unimpressed by rank and verbiage, and is often delightfully on-target with its criticisms of administration’s decisions. On the other hand, the student press can be, and is, often anti-intellectual, and closed to discussions of points of view or explanations other than its own. As a result, a relatively new development in the field of student press is the emergence of administration-produced, student-oriented newspapers. While this “alternate” press is functioning reality today on only four campuses, it is acknowledged by students and administrators alike to be a portent of things to come.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in *The Blasted Pine* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1957).

A problem about which student editors complain is that of correcting the "image" of the student presented in the daily press, and, more important, the description of the goals of student activists, which editors feel has been distorted or misunderstood by dailies. Possibly this misunderstanding is a result of a retreat into a new jargon on the part of student activists, who tend to rely less on "proper English usage" than other speech-makers with whom daily reporters come into contact. Indeed, student editors and leaders seem to feel they are unique in dealing with the problem of press misinterpretation, and express incredulity when it is suggested that businessmen, even politicians, have sometimes registered complaints of distortion by the press.

Once again reaching into A. J. M. Smith's satire of the twenties, we find in "College Spirit" an engaging description of the limited, one-dimensional university against which student journalists have railed and continue to protest:

Our boys and girls must be taught  
Right ideas from the start.  
There is great danger  
In independent thought –  
We'll have none of it here,  
No fear! <sup>2</sup>

While the student press has changed in structure, in content, in personnel, and in direction, it has been, throughout its Canadian history, the "protector-in-principle" of student independent thought and expression. It has two predominant goals: first, to reflect the developing and independent thought of the student community which it serves; and, second, to lead it—more recently expanding its focus beyond the student community into the world.

## A CONTEMPORARY HISTORY – THE SIXTIES

An examination of the student press during the sixties indicates a gradual shift in emphasis – a shift paralleled in the student movements of the decade. In the late fifties and early sixties, the student press was a soft, unconcerned medium, self-satisfied. Its editorial criticisms were more often framed in laughter than those of today, and its targets tended to be other members of the student community. The student press in 1960 was not thoughtless – just complacent. It could laugh at Senator Joseph McCarthy in retrospect because the threat posed by his type of conservative-paranoia seemed removed from the Canadian scene. It could satirize The Bomb because the atrocious realities of the nuclear threat seemed illogical, hence unreal. And while student theatrical productions were polished, intellectual, and sophisticated satirical reviews with great appeal to the academic community, the student press was similarly a part of the ivory tower – and of the comfortable élite which inhabited that tower.

1962-63 was a key year in the development of the Canadian student press in the decade, for it was the year in which students initiated a re-examination of the goals and perspectives of student journalism in light of the changing concerns of the

---

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*

student world. The re-examination extended to the role of the student press in the student community, the philosophy of the press as “leader” of the community, the financial structures and place of staff within the organizational press structure – and it has continued over the past seven years.

By 1962, a “search for identity” characterized the student, who began to search his conscience to find answers to problems which, it appeared, were created and endured by his forefathers. The student press also began to seek answers, and its questions were framed in terms of justice, equality, opportunity, freedom. James Baldwin, Norman Mailer, and Salinger spoke to students through their novels, and the student press responded. John F. Kennedy articulated many of the ideals of the student community, and received wide coverage and editorial acclaim in Canadian student media.

Two events involving the United States in the 1962-63 academic year shocked the Canadian student press out of its previous gentility: the crushingly tense, dramatic, and fearful night of the Cuban Missile crisis; followed closely by the “March on Washington.” The black freedom movement in the United States became a “cause” for Canadian student journalists, as did opposition to South African apartheid and the white government policies in Rhodesia. Peace movements on campus grew stronger in 1962-63 (Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, later Student Union for Peace Action), and while student editors could not philosophically wear the “peace buttons” in 1963, they began to present the views of the peace movement in their papers. In the same period, the student press began to echo student government leaders who asked for participation by students in university government and its decisions.

By 1965, the orientation of the peace movement shifted to a peace-social movement, and the student press in Canada shifted with it – combining in fact the two earlier movements of the sixties: equality and peace. Kennedy was dead, and the student press came out of its mourning with a vigour and aggressiveness unmatched in the decade.

Its first target was the university community itself, which the student press felt, was failing to provide leadership in society and was becoming a factory for people “trained for jobs” rather than a centre for intellectual inquiry through which solutions for the problems of society were discovered. The link between the business community (through boards of governors) and the universities perpetuated this *status quo*, and the student press vigorously campaigned for new directions for universities – and for student participation in determining that direction.

“In loco parentis,” the tradition that universities must bear responsibility for the morals and behavior of its students in place of the parent, became a key issue and critical focus in 1963-64, and the student press opted against tradition. It demanded that students be accepted as equals in the academic community, and share the responsibility and power of decision for that community.

By 1965-66, the press was no longer presenting its goals in terms of “asking,” but substituting “demands” for requests. By this time also, the student press was beginning to see the student community as a “repressed minority” – again echoing the views of the student political leadership in the country, who were in fact, drawing from ideological developments in the American student movement.



This period of thought led into the next phase — that of identifying the student minority with other “repressed minorities” — women, laborers, blacks, Indians, and so on — again, a mirror of American student thought. During 1966-67, the student press engaged in some theoretical reflection on this question, and coupled it with the earlier and still-emphatic views on social equality and the demands of the peace movement.

In 1967-68, and in the year following, the student press moved out of the theoretical phase, and into a period of action. Student journalists began in 1968-69 to produce community newspapers, which reached beyond the university student and his concerns and were directed to high school students, factory workers, strikers, and other minority or special-interest groups. Those newspapers which did not produce community issues *per se* nonetheless covered within their pages those same points of view expressed in the community newspapers.

The following survey provides an illustration of the present status of the student press in its production of community newspapers. These newspapers are produced with two goals in mind: to educate, and to promote activity in areas where students feel injustice exists. They are often propagandist in tone, but editors feel this is necessary to meeting the goals which they have set for the papers.

Readership is difficult to estimate or determine since the community newspapers are distributed by hand by students, and follow-up surveys have not been undertaken by any of the newspapers to date. At least one paper, the *Chevron*, hopes to complete a readership survey in the coming academic year.

Not included in the list is a description of a unique situation in which the Toronto Newspaper Guild asked student assistance in manning picket lines at Peterborough during the reporters' strike at the *Examiner*. Students from the *Ontario*, along with a committee of “Peterborough citizens,” published a newspaper, printed in Guelph, which supported the strikers, and was called the “Peterborough Free Press.” It ran weekly for approximately two months, and was financed by advertising and sales.

There is some consideration in the student press of the possibility of selling rather than giving away the community newspapers. The *Gateway* has already adopted a policy of street-sales, and the *Chevron* is considering selling its community issues. Certainly, experiments with selling the issues will be tried this year, and may bring a new scope to student newspaper operations in the future.

## NON-OBJECTIVE REPORTING

Until 1965-66, the standards of journalistic proficiency exacted by the daily press were accepted and served by the student press. The objective news report, written in “pyramid” news style, was accepted as the standard news format. Interpretative articles and news features, involving a point of view on the part of the author, were identified as such and by-lined. Editorial views and guest opinion were conspicuously labelled as such. By the mid-sixties, however, there was serious questioning of the legitimacy and possibility of the “unbiased” news report among student editors.



In 1967, the *Chevron* at the University of Waterloo became the first of many student newspapers to attempt the "non-objective" newspaper, in which biases were explained and presented editorially, and news copy written in accordance with that "identified bias." Experiments with non-objective newspapers continued at the *McGill Daily*, the *Ontarion*, the *Ubysey*, and the *Carillon*. Some papers dismiss the non-objective technique because, as student editors said in interviews, "it invites the production of propaganda sheets," or because the non-objective newspaper can become a "house-organ for like-minded students which are vehicles for in-jokes and in-thoughts." However, in the past three years, other newspapers have begun to utilize the technique, and it is expected to remain a part of student journalism for some time. This is particularly apparent with those newspapers which accept the philosophy of the student press as being an "agent for social change," that philosophy then becoming the "bias" from which student journalists write.

## FINANCIAL GROWTH

Just as university student newspapers have broadened their scope during the sixties, so have their financial structures changed and their budgets increased. While in 1962-63, the high-budget student newspaper in Canada was the *Varsity* at University of Toronto with a budget of \$40,000, today there are at least four student newspapers with annual budgets of close to \$100,000. This group includes the *Varsity*, the *McGill Daily*, the *Ubysey*, and the *Chevron*. If the *Gateway* completes its proposed change from tri-weekly to daily publication this year, its anticipated budget will be more than \$103,000.

At Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the student newspaper the *Eye-Opener* has a 1969-70 budget for its weekly publication which exceeds the total 1962-63 budget of the daily *Ryersonian*. In 1962-63, the *Ryersonian* was the only student publication at Ryerson, and has now become the laboratory paper for the Journalism course at the Institute.

In 1969-70, advertising revenue in student newspapers across Canada who are members of Canadian University Press will exceed \$600,000. In 1962-63, the total value of advertising revenue in C.U.P. papers was approximately \$150,000, or one quarter of today's value. And as the dollar-value of student newspapers has dramatically increased over this short period, so has the audience which the student publications reach trebled in the period.

## THE GROWTH OF RADICALISM

No discussion of the student press in Canada today would be valid without some interpretation of the contemporary student community which its press reflects. The "radical" ideas which are prevalent today in the student leadership are a natural outgrowth of previous developments in the decade which have been outlined. They are also in large part a reflection of views held in popular student movements in the United States, and a result of student activities in that country.

The original philosophy of the Students for a Democratic Society, as framed in the Port Hope statement, is well known and broadly accepted amongst Canadian student leaders, particularly on a national level of student affairs.

In 1969, national student organizations were less unified organizationally than during the sixties. The leadership, both elected and appointed, of the national student organization – the Canadian Union of Students – became the radical student leadership in the country; that is, those students who demand immediate and unconditional changes in the system, if necessary, by overturning present structures in the process. This leadership group survived the withdrawal of fifteen major member councils from the organization during 1969 – these councils having left C.U.S. in protest of its “radical” activities and pronouncements. C.U.S. membership dropped from 140,000 students to 53,000 students then, and despite an attempt to develop a philosophy and policy satisfactory to both liberals and radical leftists, referendums held on campuses in the fall of 1969 ensured the failure of C.U.S. Following the defeat of the association, its records, studies and papers were sold to Queen’s University to form part of its library collection.

If the Canadian Union of Students had survived, the elected leaders could have seen the development as a victory, since their position was one of rebuilding C.U.S. and emphasizing student-related issues.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the radical leaders would view the return as a victory since moderate leaders are often drawn in support of radical activities – after the fact of the activities. So at Columbia University in New York, for instance, the radical activists (Students for a Democratic Society and the Students Afro-American Society) created the pressures, the issues, and the activity, and – after the fact – the liberal faculty and students were vital supporters of the “revolution.”<sup>4</sup> And these similar tactics have been evidenced at Berkely, University of Montreal, University of Saskatchewan, Regina, Sir George Williams, McGill, and Simon Fraser Universities.

The philosophy of the radicals stems basically from the social analysis of Karl Marx, which holds that members of particular classes are aware of mutual interests and a class identity, and strive through collective action to perpetuate or change to its benefit those interests and that identity. Thus, Marxist theory predicts social change through class struggle, and the “class consciousness” becomes an ideological concept which is the centre of revolutionary social movements.

While social theorists have for the most part abandoned the Marxist view as unrealistic as a means of analysing present urban-technological societies, the radical students have adopted the theory, and added to it the ideas of Herbert Marcuse on repressive tolerance.<sup>5</sup>

Professor Marcuse, who teaches philosophy at the University of California at San Diego, holds that “tolerance” of the political system, its institutions and practices, while appearing to be a liberating practice is by itself oppressive and suppressive. Thus, minority groups are repressed because they “tolerate” the

---

<sup>3</sup> *The Financial Post*, August 21/69, “Better Temper on Campus” by Ian Roger; *The Globe and Mail*, September 1/69, “CUS Eases Left Politics for Support” by Ross Munro.

<sup>4</sup> *Saturday Night*, July, 1969, “The Ominous Politics of the Students Left” by George Woodcock; *Issue*, October, 1968, “The U.S. Experience” By Cyril Levitt.

<sup>5</sup> Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Beacon Press, 1966.

oppressive manifestations of the democratic system. And radical student leaders believe that students – along with Indians, Eskimos, the poor, the workers, women, ethnic groups, and so on – are repressed minorities who ought not to tolerate the conditions which suppress them. The “rich,” while statistically a minority, are not a repressed minority because they have the power and the “class consciousness” to work in collusion in order to maintain the *status quo*. And so – the “revolution” and the “movement.”<sup>6</sup>

This radical philosophy, coupled with a genuine and humanistic hatred and fear of war and its manifestations (indicated, for instance, by wide-spread student opposition to the Vietnam war), merges with most liberal, committed student demands that they be allowed to participate in those decisions which will affect their lives and the development of society, and to make those changes which they feel are necessary to eliminate inequality and oppression.

As a consequence of development of “radicalism” in the student movement in general, there has been an introduction and increase in radical newspapers produced by students. The editor of the *Ubysey*, Michael Finlay, summed up the philosophy of the radical student newspaper as follows:

The line which we pursue . . . is that the world is going to hell in a handbasket (environmental collapse, famine, nuclear war, germ war, chemical war, whatever you like) and that we, the youth of the world, are its only hope for survival. Pretty grim prognosis. The fact is, if we don't save it, who will?

Ergo, we are out to save the world by destroying the military-industrial-capitalist-imperialist system. And we do this by presenting a picture of the world (in microcosm, usually) that people will find so frightening that they will be moved to take action. Mind you, the picture we draw is totally true and factual. The fact is, a true and factual picture of things is enough to make people that frightened. It will take time, but we've been waiting a long while and can wait a little more.

With these basic tenets accepted, we then go about the nitty-gritty business of putting out a paper. These larger goals merge into our lesser goals on campus.<sup>7</sup>

The editor of the *McGill Daily*, Mark Wilson, added:

We try to give our readers the information they need to equip themselves to cope with the world, under the slogans “Information is Power” and “Power to the People.” We also think that most of our readers have, fairly close to the surface, impulses in favor of a society where they and everybody else can develop and realize their full human potential and we try to pass on tips as to what must be done in order to bring this about. Those with a vested interest in monopoly capitalism in any or all of its aspects, and their apologists, seem to become very agitated at this.<sup>8</sup>

It must be stressed that the radical philosophical views are not held by the average, uninvolved student, or by all student leaders, who tend to be more moderate and liberal in philosophy than Marxist-socialist. The aims of the radical student, however, cannot be distinguished from the aims of the moderate or liberal in many cases, and there follows a supportive sympathy. Radical students are politically oriented, and as a “tactic,” work to elect or choose other like-minded

---

<sup>6</sup>*Encounter*, March, 1969: “Men and Ideas – Herbert Marcuse” by Maurice Cranston.

<sup>7</sup>Written in response to questions for this paper.

<sup>8</sup>Written in response to questions for this paper.



students to positions of power within student organizations (council and press) on individual campuses and nationally. This effort is no more insidious, however, than attempts by like-minded individuals of a political party to gain power in the country during an election; the attainment of power provides the means by which change can be effected.

Again, the student press is not monolithic — some editors are “radicals,”<sup>9</sup> some are not. The views of the student radicals are treated by all papers with differing emphasis, but are treated because they affect all student activities and events. These ideas explain to some extent the nature of the community described and reflected in the student press. As a consequence of the changing nature of student activities and thought, the “editorial enemy” has shifted during the sixties from the student councils to the administrations, and to provincial and federal governments, who have power to make changes in society. The focus of attention of the student press is no longer sports activity, campus queens, and freshman hazing — as it tended to be in the late fifties. Rather the attention is directed to the wider community and the social system of which the university is a part.

## STUDENT NEWSPAPER PRODUCTION

### PUBLISHERS

In the majority of instances, student publications are published by student unions or student councils on the individual campus. Thus, in legal fact, student unions who are responsible for student government on campus, as publishers, become liable for content of student-produced journalism, along with editors and staffers. Many student governments have incorporated or are being incorporated to establish legal independence from the university administration, and as a by-product of the incorporation, individual student political leaders are better able to avoid individual and personal responsibility for the content of student newspapers.

In actual fact, student governments exercise little control over newspaper content — and certainly do not read the papers in advance of publication. Their role as publisher, then, has become one of reacting to the policies and content of student newspapers rather than determining them. When student councils have attempted to set newspaper policy (as in the case of the *Peak* and the *Georgian* in 1968), the publication of the paper was disrupted and staffs resigned. It is the view of the student press that the publisher's role is to be a “nominal” publisher, and any further interest in content on his part is interpreted as an “abridgement of the freedom of the student press.”

While in 1962-63 publishers of student newspapers had effective control over the selection of the editor-in-chief, in 1969 that control has become more one of ratification than of actual selection. On more and more campuses, editors are elected by the staffs or recommended by the former editor, and, in all but one case, reported in 1969,<sup>10</sup> the staff selections were accepted by the student councils. In

---

<sup>9</sup> Radical student newspapers would include, among others: *The Ubysssey*, *The McGill Daily*, *The Chevron*, *The Carillon*, *The St. Mary's Journal*.

<sup>10</sup> *The Uniter*, University of Winnipeg; Staff selection refused by council.

1969, the *Varsity* at University of Toronto underwent its first S.A.C. election for *Varsity* editor in five years because the *Varsity* staff itself could not agree on a recommendation to the publications committee of the Students' Administrative Council.

On most campuses, student editors can be removed by council vote, usually on grounds of financial or journalistic incompetence. In some instances, however, such as at the *Chevron*, the editor must resign to be removed from office.

Student councils as publishers of student newspapers play two other important roles in determining the nature of the publication: they decide the financial participation of the student body in the newspaper by setting a student grant to the paper (usually on the recommendation of the editor), and they exercise financial control through communications or publications committees. Because of this financial involvement, student councils can effectively determine the number of issues of the newspaper which will appear in any given year, or the type of technical improvements which will be made in the newspaper when they hinge on financial commitments for equipment and material. In 1968-69 at the University of Guelph, for instance, the Student Council committed itself to a \$10,000 equipment expenditure in addition to the usual student grant to the *Ontarion*. This money was used to purchase IBM composing equipment for use by the newspaper staff in the production of the newspaper.<sup>11</sup>

The publishers of the newspapers also determine the salary or honorarium to be paid to the editor-in-chief and his staff for the publication year. The introduction of salaries and honorariums began at the *Varsity* in the early 1960s, and has been adopted gradually at most campus newspapers since 1963.

## BUDGETS AND FINANCING

As indicated earlier in this paper, the production of student newspapers has become "big business" on many campuses in Canada. The student media take the largest share of the individual student's Student Activities fee, and, thus, at most universities represent the largest single expenditure of student councils.

The financial contribution from student government to student media represents only a portion of the income with which a student newspaper operates — the remainder of the income coming from advertising, usually from local sources. On a minority of campuses, additional revenue accrues to the student newspaper through the sale of services in printing and design. A minor proportion of income becomes available through paid circulation, which amounts on most newspapers to approximately one percent or less of total income.

The following table indicates financial structures of representative Canadian student newspapers for the two year period, 1968-69, and the proposed figures for 1969-70, where these are available. Where the 1969-70 budgets are not included, it is an indication that they have not yet been finalized, or were not made available for this paper.

---

<sup>11</sup> Financial structures are detailed in the next section of this chapter.



Table 1. Student Newspaper Financing

Newspaper	University Enrolment	Total Budget	1968-69				1969-70			
			Student Grant	Advertising Revenue	Total Budget	Student Grant	Advertising Revenue	Total Budget	Student Grant	Advertising Revenue
			Dollars	Per Cent	Dollars	Dollars	Per Cent	Dollars	Dollars	Per Cent
<i>The Argosy Weekly</i> . . . . .	1,250	6,500	5,200	80	1,300	6,500	20	5,200	1,300	80
<i>The Argus</i> . . . . .	2,000	13,000	9,000	69	4,000	14,000	31	9,000	5,000	36
<i>The Athenaeum</i> . . . . .	2,000	11,500	6,000	52	5,500	13,000	40	7,000	6,000	46
<i>The Brunswickan</i> . . . . .	4,000	16,000	6,300	39	9,700	21,215	61	8,915	11,700	58
<i>The Carillon</i> . . . . .	4,200	23,000	15,000	65	8,000	n/a	35	n/a	n/a	
<i>The Carleton</i> . . . . .	6,000	25,000	15,000	60	10,000	25,000	40	12,000	13,000	52
<i>The Chevron</i> . . . . .	10,500	66,000	30,000	46	36,000	97,700	54	49,700	48,000	48
<i>Dal Gazette</i> . . . . .	4,000	n/a	n/a		n/a	18,500	46	8,500	10,000	54
<i>The Equinox</i> . . . . .	700	2,000	2,000	100	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	0
<i>The Eye-Opener</i> . . . . .	6,200	10,000	5,000	50	5,000	15,000	50	Re-invested	15,000	100
<i>The Gateway (tri-weekly)</i> . . . . .		65,000	30,000	48	30,000	75,000	48	30,000	37,000	49
<i>The Gateway (daily)</i> . . . . .	18,000					103,000	25	30,000	78,000	75
<i>The Gauntlet</i> . . . . .	8,000	18,500	8,000	43	10,500	30,000	57	15,000	15,000	50
<i>The Georgian</i> . . . . .	6,000	32,000	10,600	33	20,000	n/a	62	n/a	n/a	
<i>Loyola News</i> . . . . .	4,200	23,300	8,000	36	15,000	n/a	64	n/a	n/a	
<i>The Manitoban</i> . . . . .	12,500	28,000	8,000	29	20,000	n/a	71	n/a	n/a	
<i>The Marlet</i> . . . . .	5,000	25,000	10,000	40	15,000	n/a	60	n/a	n/a	
<i>McGill Daily</i> . . . . .	15,000	85,000	35,000	42	50,000	90,000	58	40,000	50,000	56
<i>The Muse</i> . . . . .	5,000	n/a	n/a		n/a	16,000		10,400	5,000	31
<i>The Ontarioan</i> . . . . .	5,500	20,000	7,000	35	13,000	20,000	65	6,500	12,500	62
<i>The Peak</i> . . . . .	6,000	n/a	n/a		n/a	20,000		7,600	12,400	62
<i>Queen's Journal</i> . . . . .	7,500	n/a	n/a		n/a	40,000		21,000	19,000	48
<i>St. Mary's Journal</i> . . . . .	2,000	9,000	3,000	33	6,000	12,000	66	5,500	6,000	50
<i>The Saint</i> . . . . .	1,600	8,000	n/a		n/a	8,000		n/a	n/a	
<i>The Sheaf</i> . . . . .	10,000	30,000	13,000	46	17,000	43,000	56	21,000	22,000	52
<i>The Silhouette</i> . . . . .	6,000	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	
<i>The Ubysses</i> . . . . .	20,000	67,500	17,000	26	50,000	70,000	74	20,000	50,000	71
<i>The Varsity</i> . . . . .	27,000	82,900	16,000	19	66,900	82,900	81	16,000	67,000	91
<i>The Western Gazette</i> . . . . .	10,000	41,000	deficit		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	
<i>Xaverian Weekly</i> . . . . .	2,000	5,500	3,000	54	2,500	6,000	46	3,000	3,000	50

Source: University Press Survey, July, 1969; Canadian University Press, 1969 Note: From the chart it can be seen that many student newspapers, with small cut-backs in the number of issues or number of pages produced, could exist without student grants. That is, some newspapers (generally those with \$8,000+ advertising revenue) could operate today without reference to financial dependence or content obligations to the student community from which they originate. The student grant does allow, however, a measure of independence from advertisers and a freedom of content because the newspapers do not survive only on advertising revenue, and can afford to lose a certain amount of content.

## ADVERTISING

Advertising is solicited for student newspapers by other students on campus, either through a central advertising bureau (which handles advertising for all student publications on campus), or through a student who acts as agent for the newspaper alone. Most agents receive a commission of 10% of advertising contracts.

Major source of advertisers is the local market close to each campus: laundries, entertainment outlets, clothing and book stores, art galleries, and so on. There are only three national advertisers who traditionally advertise in the student press across Canada today: Coca-Cola, Tampax, and The Bank of Montreal, and students jealously guard these accounts. In the early sixties, students also drew from such national advertisers as Canadian Breweries (O'Keefe), The Royal Bank of Canada, and national book publishers; but these sources are apparently no longer available on a wide basis, although they may advertise in specific publications during specific advertising campaigns.

Student newspapers, on the other hand, have captured and hold local advertisers who can benefit directly from the students' spending power, and who are more likely to ignore the "philosophy" of the newspaper than their national counterparts. The fact that the student press is not geared to profit-making allows it to be less solicitous of national advertisers' views of their publications than their commercial counterparts might be.

Some student editors believe that national advertisers do not seek out student publications today because the advertisers fear their images will be tarnished through association with the "radical student press." National advertisers do commit themselves to advertising in magazines such as *Campus*, an independently owned and operated magazine which is distributed on a profit-making basis to students on campuses across Canada, and which is moderate in tone and content. The publisher of *Issue*, (the Canadian Union of Students), was advised by its advertising agency to "have student opinions voicing various opinions on contentious issues," to "have points of view expressed by the administration," and to "avoid topics like Rhodesia" in the paper.<sup>12</sup> While this may be good advice to students who hope to attract advertisers, it is felt by them to be an interference in editorial policy and undue advertising pressure on the press. As a consequence, *Issue* has not carried advertising since it began publication, although it will attempt to include advertising in the 1969-70 publishing year.

Student editors agree with the philosophy of the daily press with regard to advertising — that it must exist apart from editorial content. The advertiser can reach his intended market by buying space in the pages of the newspaper, and in the case of the university student press, the audience is a select and defined group. The relationship between the advertiser and the newspaper, then, is a business arrangement between purchaser and supplier of space, with the advertiser having no further influence on the content of the newspaper.

Student editors are initiating plans for a centrally-operated co-operative agency to solicit national advertising for all student newspapers in Canada, and while today

---

<sup>12</sup> Letter to CUS National President, September 1968

plans are still being discussed, it is expected that the agency will operate under the auspices of Canadian University Press within the next two years. Virtually all student editors interviewed for this paper expressed enthusiasm for the central agency, and are anxious to enter the national advertising market.

## CIRCULATION AND DISTRIBUTION

At most student newspapers, circulation figures (that is, estimated press run) closely approximate total full-time student enrolment at the university from which the publication ensues. Paid circulation, for which subscriptions costs generally cover postal charges, is minimal on all campuses.

Informal surveys completed in the last two years at the *Gauntlet*, St. Mary's *Journal* and the *Chevron* indicate that student newspapers are received by 85% to 90% of students, faculty, and administration on each of these campuses. Interviews with editors of other campus publications confirm these results, which are also similar to results received at the *Brunswickan* and the *Carleton* from surveys completed in 1963. The 1963 surveys indicated that 86% to 91% of all personnel (students, administration and faculty) on campus received the student newspaper.

The *Gateway*, which produced statistically valid readership surveys in 1966-67, indicated a similar readership on campus. Their results showed a front-page readership of 80% of students in all faculties<sup>13</sup>—a probable reflection of the number of students who receive the paper. The remaining 20% of the *Gateway*'s press run would be received by faculty and administration members. Circulation on campus, then, is predictable for any given year, and the proportion of people in the university community who receive student newspapers has been relatively stable through the years.

An interesting sidelight to the stability of circulation in ordinary circumstances is that, in "extraordinary" circumstances, the circulation figures remain constant. Thus, at times of major news breaks, editors report that there is no accompanying increase in readership. Of similar interest is the fact that, on those campuses where for various reasons the student newspapers are not "liked," they are nonetheless read, and press runs are not decreased, according to editors.

Distribution of student newspapers is handled on most campuses by newspaper staff, who in other roles and at other times might be managing editors, reporters, lay-out staff, or cartoonists. Distribution is generally to specific and traditional drop-off points throughout the campus (eating centres, halls, lobbies, lounges) where they are picked up by readers. On some larger campuses, the printer delivers the newspapers directly to the drop-off points, thus eliminating the staff distribution. Distribution points are usually checked by staff members for efficiency at frequent or infrequent intervals depending on the campus.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Gateway* survey, 1966-67.



## STUDENT PRESS ORGANIZATIONS

### CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Canadian University Press is a co-operative newsgathering and news distributing organization which includes in its membership some forty-nine major campus newspapers across Canada – in total, approximately 85% of Canadian primary student media. In the past five years, membership has close to doubled (thirty full and associate members in 1964), and with new universities and community colleges in the first stage of student organization and newspaper production, the organization should again double in the next five years.

Membership in C.U.P. is open to any Canadian newspaper produced by students of an educational institution beyond the secondary-school level. It is not, unfortunately, a national organization, in that there are no French-language members at the present time. Major French-language newspapers withdrew from C.U.P. in 1963 to form their own *Presse Etudiante Nationale* (P.E.N.), which itself dissolved in 1967. In 1963, the French-language editors felt that the copy standards provided by C.U.P. were not applicable to the kinds of newspaper-journals which were produced by Quebec students at French-language institutions, where they required more “agitative-feature” material.<sup>14</sup>

From a full-time office established in Ottawa in 1960, C.U.P. provides its members with a mimeographed and mailed news service, feature service, and photo service when available. Each paper receives copy on a split schedule, with some newspapers on a five-times-weekly mailing, others on two-times weekly, and so on, depending on local publishing schedules. As well, C.U.P. provides Telex or wire news service to members on fast-break stories. More than twenty-five C.U.P. members have Telex or access to a Telex machine.

The news copy provided by C.U.P. is well-written, and provides members with details of happenings within and without the student community. It does not meet the objective-reporting standards which would be required for instance, at Canadian Press or at any daily newspaper—or those which were required by C.U.P. as recently as 1965. It is unabashedly non-objective. The present president of C.U.P., Stewart Saxe, explained that in his view, the unbiased news report is a myth created by the daily press. The human being is non-objective, and as a result any report of a newsworthy event must be recognized as including the biased interpretation of the reporter. The recognition of the bias, however, does not excuse conscious management of the news, and thus all fact situations must be accurate.

These views are fairly widely held within the student press (as outlined in “Non-Objective Reporting”) when they relate to individual newspapers, but are less acceptable when pursued by the news service, according to a survey of editors for this paper. Some editors complained of the necessity of re-writing all C.U.P. news copy; to which C.U.P. would reply that one bias was being substituted for another. The *Carleton* withdrew from C.U.P. in objection to its news-writing standards two years ago, but is expected to return in 1970. Certainly the students are battling out in practice a journalistic problem which is discussed at every daily

---

<sup>14</sup>Letter to CUP members from the editor of *Le Quartier Latin* (for PEN), January, 1963.

newspaper conference, and in every journalism school, and one which has come to the fore of student journalism only since 1967.

Throughout its thirty-eight year history, Canadian University Press has been a service organization and a co-operative service. It has been concerned with the development of journalistic standards on campus newspapers, and until 1966 sponsored national competitions for news writing, feature writing, editorial writing and so on. These competitions were then eliminated because student editors felt they were counter-productive: members hesitated to use good material from other member papers since new and original material was required and expected for competition. As well, the competitions tended to encourage the standards of the daily press within student newspapers, and to eliminate experimentation with technique, content, and approach. Thus, in 1969, because "co-operatives co-operate, they don't compete," members are encouraged to "steal" techniques, copy, and illustrations from other members; and, due to the facility of photo-offset production, whole pages are often reprinted from a second member's paper.

To replace the competitive method of improving journalistic standards, C.U.P. has initiated (in 1968) a system of field-workers who travel from campus to campus to assist members with production and to conduct staff and editorial instruction sessions. At present, C.U.P. has one national field-worker, and hopes to introduce a second in the Atlantic region this fall. In addition, at each regional (Western, Ontario, Quebec, and Atlantic), C.U.P. conference seminars are held to assist editors with adopting new techniques and mastering old ones.

In addition to this, through the national office each member paper can request a professional critique of that publication. The critique will be prepared by a working journalist from the commercial press, and subsequently used by the publication concerned as it sees fit.

Aside from the services provided, a large part of the value derived from the organization stems from its annual national conferences, at which editors and staffers meet to exchange views and predict directions of the student press. The conferences provide editors and staff members with a national perspective on student affairs, and most editors agree that C.U.P.'s great value lies in its function of relating and extending student concerns beyond the isolation of the local university campus.

As a condition of membership in C.U.P., each newspaper agrees to uphold the "Statement of Principles of the Student Press in Canada" and the "Code of Ethics of the Canadian University Press." As an indication of the changes which have occurred in the philosophy of the student press since 1964, it is worthwhile to compare the "Statement of Principles" of five years ago with those of today. At the conclusion of the 26th National Conference of C.U.P. in 1964, the statement of principles (then called the Charter) read:

Whereas the Canadian Student Press believes in the following principles:  
that freedom of expression and debate by means of a free and vigorous press is essential to the effectiveness of an educational community in a democratic society;  
that where the student press is a function of the student government, or of the university administration, this should in no way be allowed to impair the freedom of the student press;



that the student press should be free of all forms of external interference;  
that it is essential to a free student press that it be responsible for the views  
and opinions it expresses;  
that the basic duties of such a free student press are to present the varied  
opinions of the students it represents, to present news fairly and without bias,  
to interpret local, national and international events, and issues of interest and  
import to students to the best of its ability; and; that it is the prerogative of  
the free student press to include literary expression as an additional basic  
duty.<sup>15</sup>

This statement of principles (which is effectively the same as that of the U.S. Student Press Association statement in 1964), an affirmation of the duties and rights of the student press was accepted by all editors of C.U.P. papers, and applauded by professional journalists and philosophers of the press. It went on to expand on those areas in which student press freedom had been abridged (which remain in the 1969 statement), and concluded:

Therefore, the Canadian Student Press affirms its belief that it should be free from abuses listed . . . and declares the following fundamental rights, duties, and responsibilities necessary for the effective implementation of the principles:

- that the Canadian student press should be free from pressure by student governments, university authorities, or any external agencies;
- that within the restrictions of the laws of libel and within the scope of their responsibilities and duties as outlined . . . the Canadian student press should be autonomous; and
- that the Canadian student press should be free to develop so that it can continue to fulfill its role in the academic community.<sup>16</sup>

The 1969 statement reflects less of a press-oriented introspection and more political orientation towards the community. The particular change which has encouraged philosophical changes (and therefore the type of paper which is produced) on individual papers is the assertion that the primary role of the student press is to act as "an agent of social change." The statement reads:

Whereas the Canadian student press believes in the following principles:

- That the major role of the student press is to act as an agent of social change, striving to emphasize the rights and responsibilities of the student citizen;
- That the student press must in fulfilling this role perform both an educative and an active function and support groups serving as agents of social change;
- That the student press must present local, national and international news fairly, and interpret ideas and events to the best of its ability;
- That the student press must use its freedom from commercial and other controls to ensure that all it does is consistent with its major role and to examine issues which other media avoid;
- And whereas freedom of the student press has been abridged in the following ways:

- Threatened or actual expulsion or suspension and/or confiscation of issues of the student newspaper by student government, administrators or faculty attempting to suppress matters which they consider uncomplimentary to or critical of the institution;
- Financial pressure used to limit or retaliate against newspaper policy;

---

<sup>15</sup>Report of the 26th National Conference, Canadian University Press.

<sup>16</sup>Report of the 31st National Conference, Canadian University Press.

Censorship of articles by faculty, civil and administrative authorities or student government, making the newspaper incapable of fulfilling its role;  
Excessive pressures, both formal and informal, used to prevent publication of particular articles and opinions;

Therefore, the student press affirms its belief that it must be free from the abuses listed above, and declares the following fundamental rights and responsibilities necessary for the effective implementation of the principles outlined above:

That the Canadian student press should be free from pressure by student governments, university authorities, or any other external agencies, whether or not the press is a part of such an organization except for the extraordinary power of removing an editor, which should reside only in the authority which appointed him;

That whenever there are serious charges of irresponsibility on the part of an editor, the extent of their validity must be determined by due process before any action is taken, and that except for the power of removal of the editor, all subsequent action should come within the internal structure of the newspaper;  
That the newspaper should be free from outside financial control and that once its budget is granted, no holdup, decrease or discontinuing of funds should be made by financial administrators unless the paper desires such change;

That within the restrictions of the laws of libel and within the scope of the principles outlined above, the Canadian student press should be autonomous, and that it is, therefore, necessary that the Canadian student press abuse neither its freedom nor the principles outlined above;

That it is essential to a free student press that it be responsible for the views it expresses and that each student newspaper should carry a disclaimer on the editorial page declaring that the opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the administration or student government;

That in no case should a representative or representatives of the student government or administration have the explicit or implied power of censorship or the power to set editorial or advertising policies;

That appointment of the editorial board and staff of the student newspaper should be internal, not subject to the discretion of external bodies;

That the editor of the student newspaper should be selected by the staff of the newspaper;

That overall policy decisions should be made through collective discussion by the staff, whenever possible;

That the Canadian student press must always be aware of its role in society and in the academic community and must be free to develop so that it can continue to fulfill its role.<sup>17</sup>

A significant addition to the "Statement of Principles" is the requirement, added in 1968-69, that editors and editorial boards should be selected by newspaper staffs (not necessarily from newspaper staffs) – a requirement that is being met on many campuses (usually with student council ratification).

The next requirement – that overall policy decisions should be made by staff discussion – is not yet a factor at most student newspapers. Most editors report that the requirement is impractical, since "staffers" are, for the most part, transients because of their primary academic commitment. At the *McGill Daily*, editorial positions within the staff are decided by staff election, and staffers in these positions are subject to replacement by staff vote. With the advent of collective policy decision-making, the *Daily* will set up this year a credentials

---

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*

committee of photo, sports, supplement, news, and editorial representatives to decide who is Staff at any given time of formal, voted decisions. The *McGill Daily* pattern is expected to serve as the example for other student newspapers, who have no formal means of determining who qualifies as a "staff member" and thus as a part of the decision-making process. C.U.P. has not given direction to its member newspapers in this area since the requirement is a relatively new one.

And despite the requirement, the editor-in-chief of each paper is still the effective controller of newspaper policy, the spokesman for the newspaper, and responsible to Student Councils for management and control of production.

### *C.U.P.-Investigation Commission*

In addition to its other services, Canadian University Press has a mechanism for investigating alleged violations of the "Statement of Principles" and/or "Code of Ethics" through its Investigation Commission.

The Commission consists of three members, each of whom is appointed at the time of a particular investigation. They include: a member of the C.U.P. executive or its appointee; a student from another member paper in the region of the paper involved (appointed by the regional president); and a member of the professional press from the regional area appointed by the editor of the paper involved in the investigation.

The Investigation Commission can be made operational in one of the following ways:

- upon written request to the C.U.P. executive by the member newspaper involved;
- upon written request to the C.U.P. executive by the publisher involved;
- upon written request to the C.U.P. executive by any three member papers in the region; or
- upon the request of the C.U.P. executive (which could arise through a petition to the C.U.P. executive by the staff of the newspaper involved).

Within a week of a request, the Investigation Commission convenes and holds hearings (calling witnesses) on the campus concerned. No one called as a witness is under compulsion to testify. A report and recommendations are prepared within two weeks of the hearings for C.U.P., the member paper, and the publisher involved. While the Investigation Commission can report and recommend, it has no authority to ensure that its recommendations are followed.

C.U.P., through its member newspapers, is encouraging Student Councils to recognize the Investigation Commission as the sole arbiter and judicial authority in matters concerning the student press, thus investing it with an authority it does not now enjoy. The only paper reporting that the C.U.P. Commission is recognized as an authority by the student council is the *Pro-Tem*, where the editor can be removed only on the recommendation of a C.U.P. Investigation Commission.

In 1968-69, two Investigation Commissions were called, at Sir George Williams University and at the University of Winnipeg. In each case, the C.U.P. Investigation Commission favoured the position of the respective editor (who in each case had requested the Commission), and the Student Councils involved each rejected the Commission's recommendations.



Student Council members contend that if the Investigation Commission is to gain wider acceptance by councils, it must ensure student council representation and eliminate its seeming pro-press bias.

## OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Press organizations other than Canadian University Press are not widely supported through the Canadian student press, although available to it. Part of the reason for this is that other student press organizations are neither located in Canada nor oriented to the Canadian student community. As well, the most recent ideological trend in the Canadian student media is Canadian nationalism — student editors have provided a great deal of space in the last two years to events outside the Canadian borders, and feel that it is now time to relate its demands (as an agent of social change) to events within Canada.

The major alternative press organizations upon which local campus papers can draw include Liberation News Service, Underground Press Syndicate, and Collegiate Press Service—all American organizations. The first two are not solely geared to student press, while the latter is a student press organization.

Liberation News Service, an independent radical press service operating out of New York city, provides graphics, news and feature copy to members, who pay subscription costs of \$15 monthly or \$180 annually for the material. Copy is written in the style of the militant radical American newspapers, and deals substantially with events within the borders of the United States. Subscribers include members of the underground and student press, and newspapers produced by radical groups such as the Students for Democratic Society. C.U.P. itself subscribes to the service, and makes use of its copy in preparation of feature articles for C.U.P. members. Several Canadian student newspapers are subscribers, but copy is sparsely used in these papers, and usually re-written. Material is mailed to subscribers.

The Underground Press Syndicate, which has recently moved to New York city from Phoenix, Arizona, is a co-operative organization for underground newspapers. For a small fee, it allows members and associates to reprint material from other member papers, and provides a newspaper-exchange system. It has approximately two hundred members, including about four Canadian student newspapers. Those belonging to the Syndicate, including the *Chevron* and the *Ubysey*, find the material valuable for feature reports, and the exchange system valuable for new lay-out techniques and ideas.

The Collegiate Press Service is the news-gathering and disseminating branch of the United States Student Press Association, and although membership in the U.S.S.P.A. is open to regular student publications in the United States, exceptions have been made for Canadian student newspapers who wish to join. The structure and operations are similar to that of C.U.P., and content is, for the most part, directed to American student events. Canadian membership is small, including about four student newspapers and C.U.P.

# RELATIONS OF THE STUDENT PRESS

## STUDENT GOVERNMENT

The student government on individual campuses usually has an initial relationship with the student press – that of publisher, (as outlined above in “A Contemporary History – The Sixties”).

In actual practice, this relationship is regarded as a nominal one. Hence, the student press is free to serve as critic or supporter of student government according to its own views and decisions. In the early 1960s, when student newspapers focused more on local campus concerns than today, the editor of the newspaper often became the “leader of the opposition” to the council president’s “prime minister.” Today, when student newspapers expend more time and space on events and developments apart from the local university, the editor has become less of the unofficial opposition leader, although still a watchdog of campus government.

Throughout Canadian student press history there has been strife between student government and student press arising out of this “opposition” role. Most recent problems seem to be rooted in differences in ideology, and while culminating in one particular incident or activity, they often stem from a broader base. Much of today’s council-press problems are the result of the production of “radical” newspapers where councils would prefer a moderate press. The following recent examples indicate the handling of some of these problems.

In February, 1969, the Sir George Williams University Students Legislative Council removed the editor of the *Georgian*, David Bowman, on grounds of financial incompetence. The circumstances arose from the printing of “extra” issues during the protesting students’ occupation of the ninth floor computer centre of the Henry Hall Building. The motion was presented two days after the \$2,000,000 damage to the computer centre, and apparently rose from additional production charges of \$720 for the “extra” issues.

The editor had turned over one of the extras to black students, an issue which allegedly contained several libellous passages; as well, he printed as fact a satirical letter indicating that the S.G.W.U. administration planned to create a situation of “controlled confrontation” between administration and students. In all of the extra issues, the editorial position was that of sympathy with the demonstrating students, a position which had not been taken by the students’ council.

The students’ council president stated that he was not prepared to add to his legal responsibility for more than the two contracted issues per week, particularly when the editor seemed to exercise bad judgment in controlling and assessing content of the extras.

The real issue in this case, however, was a question of opposing ideologies, and should have led to an examination of journalistic rather than financial incompetence.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Report, Investigation Commission hearings, February, 1969.



Prior to this incident, the *Georgian* had incurred the dislike of students and the council for its "radical" editorial policy and content – and this basic disagreement led ultimately to the dramatic removal of the editor in the context of a volatile political situation. Recommendations of a Canadian University Press Investigation Commission that the editor be reinstated were not followed by council, and a new editor whose publishing and political views more closely approximated those of council was appointed.

At the *Uniter* at the University of Winnipeg, tension arose concerning the appointment of an editor for 1969-70 in March, 1969, when the student council did not accept the newspaper staff recommendation for editor, and placed another student in that position. In September, 1968, the same council removed an editor after he had produced one issue because of its "radical" content and ideology. Again, the council appears to have chosen the 1969-70 incoming editor to avoid the "radical" continuity which the staff preferred.

At the *Carleton* in 1967, the editor published a special edition to tell about the withdrawal of one presidential candidate in the student council elections. As a result, the council passed a constitutional amendment prohibiting distribution of the paper forty-eight hours before an election. The amendment still stands.

At St. Mary's University in 1965, the student council was forced by its own constitution to remove an editor of the *Journal* who had been suspended by the administration "for conduct unbecoming a student of Saint Mary's." Today, as a result of a constitutional amendment by a sympathetic council, the editor can hold his position whether or not he is a student, and despite administration views of his "conduct."

At the *Sheaf*, in early 1969, an attempt was made by the students' council to appoint two advisers to the newspaper to improve the quality of reporting, and to bring about a change back to "objective reporting." When the editorial board of the newspaper threatened to resign, the council withdrew its forceful opposition, and the motion was defeated by two votes.

The present editor of the *Athenaeum* reported the ups and downs of council-press relations in 1969 at Acadia University:

The editor-in-chief was fired by the Students' Representative Council on the recommendation of the [newspaper] staff for setting up an illegal wiretap of a Union Executive secret meeting. The secret meeting was being held to determine whether the editor should be fired for printing too much "obscene material" and articles about Viet Nam, marijuana, etc. Catching the editor [wire-tapping] gave the council an excuse to fire him. The staff decided to recommend firing in order that they could disavow any knowledge of wiretapping and to be clear of any implication. The staff then nominated [by the constitution] a new editor. He was rejected [by council] for fear that he would produce a similar paper. After heated Council battles, the staff of the paper was forced to accept a constitution that effectively removed control over the choice of Editor from the staff [and gave it] to the Students Council. A new editor was chosen [coincidentally approved by the staff]. This person had no experience and managed to put out a mediocre but acceptable paper. Once on better terms with the Council, a new constitution was written by the staff returning past powers and adding new ones. It was passed by the council.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Written in response to questions for this paper.

Other incoming editors gave amusing reports of council-press relations. The editor of the University of Ottawa's *Union* magazine, for example, recalled that two years ago "an imprudent editor was a Ché fan and everyone got so tired of him that they (council) purged him in a true revolutionary fashion."

The *Eye-Opener's* editor told of an incident at Ryerson in late fall, 1968, "when two student members of the Board of Governors were upset at a mention in the paper, and when they learned that we painted our office black" they attempted to take measures against the paper. The *Eye-Opener*, in retaliation, "fought them off as we always do with reactionaries."

And a resigned editor at the *Lance* wrote with a sigh that instances of council-press hostilities at the University of Windsor "are far too numerous and complicated to mention."

Healthy tensions between government and press exist in all societies where a free press is guaranteed. In the student society, a very safe prediction would be that student council and press relations will often be strained, particularly when councils have dual roles as publisher of the newspapers and government of the students. An unfortunate aspect of council-press relations is that councils can take measures against the student press when editorial policies and comment is in opposition to council views by applying the inherent "publishers' power" to that situation. And in those situations, the student press can be expected to "fight them off as we always do with reactionaries."

## UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIONS

Student press relations with university administrations have been very volatile during the last half of the decade, for students have recognized that administrations hold the keys to changes wanted by students, and which were heretofore locked away from them.

On virtually every campus in Canada, the student press has assumed the role of critic of the administration, the President, and the Board of Governors. On some campuses, such as the University of Toronto, the student press has played a positive role in presenting accounts of student demands to the administration by approaching the question without hostility and as a problem for the whole university.

At other universities, relations are not quite as free from conflict, and much of the reason for the lack of serenity is not what is said, but how it is said in the student press. The press, viewing Boards of Governors as absentee landlords who control a university of which they are not a part, has often presented one-sided pictures of members of the Boards, their interests, and their problems in connection with the university. The *Chevron*, the *Eye-Opener*, and the *Ontarion*, among others, have presented lists of members of their Boards of Governors accompanied by their business associations — a technique designed to portray a group with limited interest in the pursuit of university goals. At Ryerson, the Board of Governors is characterized as the "Bored of Governors" in the student press; at the *Brunswickan*, members are referred to as BOG's.

Administrations have taken action against the student press in order to stop publication or change direction of the individual newspapers, but more and more the legal status of the newspaper makes it unavailable for administrative censure.

In February, 1968, the editor of *Argosy Weekly* was removed from office by the president of the university, at the request of the student-faculty board, for publication of the controversial "Student as Nigger" article. Similar publication at the *Carleton* and the *Ontarion*, as well as on other campuses, brought no administration repercussions.

At the St. Mary's University in 1968-69, the administration suspended the editor of the *Journal* and a columnist for "printing and disseminating an obscene article, under the title of 'Mother Tucker'." Under the by-laws of the Students Association at the time, the editor was no longer able to hold his position. The administration then issued a press release concerning the incident, and called for a public retraction and apology through local off-campus media from both students involved. The editor agreed and was allowed to write his examinations, while the columnist refused and threatened legal action. The administration then allowed both students to be reinstated after they had published an apology in the *Journal* only.

At the *Brunswickan*, the administration has complained of the fact that the editor was a non-student, thus allowing little control over his policies by the administration from within the structure. This situation is similar to that at the *Varsity*, the *Western Gazette*, the *Chevron*, and the *Ontarion*, where editors are employed full-time, and are not necessarily students at the university during their terms as editor.

Some student editors emphasized that their working relations with administration were amicable and open. Editors at the *Carleton*, the *Arthur*, and the *Saint* were among those who were enthusiastic about the role of the administration in dealing with students and the student press on campus.

### *Administration Newspapers*

Several university administrations have begun to publish newspapers which are directed to students, faculty and administrative staff, and whose intention is largely to present facts not included in student publications, and to correct some interpretations of university events as presented in the student press.

Administration newspapers to this end are produced at the University of Waterloo, University of British Columbia, and McGill University and will commence in 1969-70 at York University. Other newspapers are expected over the next five year period at a number of Canadian campuses.

Budgets range from a high of \$110,000 annually at the *McGill Reporter*, to \$10,000 annually at the *Gazette* (Waterloo). Budgets have not yet been determined for the *Bulletin* at York University, and figures are unavailable for *U.B.C. Reports*. The first paper to accept advertising will be the *McGill Reporter*, which intends to solicit \$10,000 advertising revenue for the 1969-70 publishing year.

The editor of the *McGill Reporter*, Harry E. Thomas, described the reasons for publication, and role in relation to student press of his publication:

The *McGill Reporter* was established by the University to provide a dependable, alternative outlet on campus for news of campus activity and comment about



matters of concern to the academic community. It was felt at the time of the founding [September, 1968] that existing publications did not provide adequate opportunity for a major segment of the university to express itself. The editors decided that the publication would die if allowed to be very parochial in emphasis. With this in mind, we have endeavoured to include a wide range of articles related to educational politics, learning reform and innovation, as well as stimulating interviews with important persons who have vital things to say about education, science, the humanities, and the social sciences.

The student newspapers remain as important publications, and we do not attempt to inhibit in any way their functions. We do not try to redress any imbalances that they are presumed to create, nor do we challenge their right to be as controversial and as narrow in view as they want to be. Our role, we believe, is to give our readers, (who in addition to students, faculty and administrative staff, include a large number of graduates, persons at other universities, and the general public) intelligent and provocative coverage of the university scene.<sup>20</sup>

R.W. Whitton, editor of the *Gazette*, which was founded in September, 1960, outlined the following background to the present publication:

Initially the *Gazette* was published almost solely for faculty and staff and served as a repository for official statements. Gradually it began to do a reporting job, uncovering campus stories that would not otherwise have been told and serving as a medium to explain the University to its audience. In the fall of 1968, the student newspaper on campus began to concentrate sharply on what might be called matters of student interest only, omitting much of the information formerly passed on to it from University departments . . . for instance, they would not run announcements of parking restrictions, forthcoming concerts and plays, statements from the President etc. except as paid advertisements. It became apparent that there was a wealth of information not being communicated to the student body, and the Information Services department proposed the *Gazette* be revamped and utilized to do this job.<sup>21</sup>

The *Gazette* has an on-campus circulation of 5,000, and is published by the University of Waterloo throughout the year. The McGill Reporter, also a weekly publication, has a total circulation of 20,000, (12,000 on-campus and 8,000 off-campus), and is published by the Senate of McGill University. The *McGill Reporter* has won several graphics awards in its year of publication, including awards from the New York Art Directors' Show, Graphics '69; *Communications Arts* magazine; and the American College Public Relations Society.

The editor of the *McGill Reporter* has expressed strong objections to the classification of the publication as a "house organ," and certainly in content, circulation, and scope, his publication bears the least resemblance to a "house organ" of all administration newspapers. He predicts that the *McGill Reporter* "will emerge this year as one of the country's most important publications," and objects to the fact that the newspaper is not permitted second-class mailing privileges, thus requiring postal costs of more than \$20,000 for a publishing year. "This is a publication having national impact, a national audience, and yet we are treated as just another in-house publication. The Ottawa bureaucracy is unrelenting in its determination to stifle creative activity in the field of Canadian journalism."<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup>Written in response to questions for this paper.

<sup>21</sup>Written in response to questions for this paper.

<sup>22</sup>Written in response to questions for this paper.

## OTHER PRESS

The student press in Canada has established good working relationships with the daily and weekly press throughout the years, indicated by the successful and frequent forums in which representatives of both media participate.

On individual campuses, the local press is often called on for assistance with training sessions, critiques, and technical instruction, and for many years the *Ubysssey* served as a "farm team" for the Vancouver *Sun*. Local press is sometimes used to assist student journalists in making new contacts, or providing clipping files and material from morgues. Most often, the working relationship is dependent in any given year on the rapport that the student newspaper editor can establish with the local press.

The daily press, weekly press, and magazines often look to the student newspaper as a source of personnel for part-time employment during the academic term, summer employment with a view to employment after graduation, and for full-time employment. From student newspapers, the commercial press has available potential reporters and deskmen who are accustomed to newspaper production, understand deadlines and copy requirements, and have had some reportorial training. Every major daily paper in Canada hires students for full or part-time employment, and in the majority of cases, experience on a student newspaper weighs heavily in the permanent hiring decision.

The attitudes held by most student journalists to the commercial press belie the good relationships which exist. Students feel that the "establishment" or "bourgeois" press is able to manipulate and distort news according to its preconceptions of situations, and does so. They also believe that the "myth of objectivity" (a term used to describe objective reporting) is a dangerous tool which can be used by the press to serve its vested interests, presenting a picture which while appearing to be objective is in fact a biased account.<sup>23</sup>

Much of this criticism stems from what students feel across Canada has been unfair and sloppy coverage of student activities by the daily press, which, they feel, has opted for sensationalism and inadequate research. As well, students are critical of what they feel is inadequate coverage of national and international events where these events affect mankind; the Vietnam war, according to students, has been covered with a bias that has allowed as much error by omission as by commission.

Despite their suspicions and criticisms of the daily press, the student press looks to it for material, for technical assistance, and for employment, and relations between the two are mutually cultivated.

## RECENT INNOVATIONS IN THE STUDENT PRESS

As well as the non-objective reporting technique and the production of community newspapers previously mentioned, student editors have introduced other "new

---

<sup>23</sup> "The Consensus Press" by Steve Ireland, *The Chevron*, April, 1969.



methods” of journalism in an attempt to produce newspapers which are lively and successful in capturing its readership audience.

A recent addition to the scope of reporting on many campuses is the classroom — where lectures are covered as news or feature material. In 1968-69, reporters were assigned to the classroom at the *Chevron*, the *Gateway*, the *Varsity*, the *Western Gazette*, the *Picaro*, the *Sheaf*, and the *Athenaeum*, and as a result of the experience on these papers, it is expected that more student newspapers will adopt the technique.

The material which is produced as a result of the foray into the classroom is varied. The *Ubyyssey* has had little luck in its attempt at classroom reporting, and its only “story” from a classroom assignment was a pungent statement which indicated that the lecture in a particular course had been cancelled for the eighth time in that semester, and for the eighth time since the reporter had been assigned to cover it.

The *Picaro*, produced at 700-student Mount St. Vincent (women’s) College, has featured reports from Racial Forums in an Afro-American history course and on the Role of Women in Politics from coverage of a lecture in a Political Institutions course. The response to this reporting has been “great,” according to the present editor, with “outsiders participating” in follow-up material.

Other editors indicate that student response has been more favorable than professors’. The latter see the introduction of the reporter into the classroom as an invasion of academic freedom. Because of the difficulty of misinterpretation of content due to the teaching technique (for example, use of satirical techniques by teachers), most classroom reporting is accompanied by an interview with the lecturer, who can provide background to the lecture and discuss the teaching method used. In most cases, the lecture is handled as would be a lecture given by a visiting speaker. As well, there is usually an automatic guarantee of rebuttal through letters, and the anonymity of students who participate in class discussion is preserved.

Technical innovations in the student press have made content innovations more simple for student production. Most student newspapers are now produced by the photo-offset method, a technique which is less costly than letter-press, and provides greater scope for wide use of photography, artwork, and exciting and challenging lay-out.

Some newspapers (*Queen’s Journal*, for example) are returning to or making more use of the tabloid journal format, thus taking “straight news” off the front page and substituting feature material or artwork (the *Ontarion* and *Chevron*). This technique is used particularly in the production of community newspapers, where feature and interpretative material provides 95% of content. The *Equinox* is limited to a magazine-journal format, and accepts no advertising.

A number of student newspapers have their own photography labs and darkrooms, and many work in conjunction with campus camera clubs for photo assignments. Because of this association (and photo-offset production), the use of experimental and art-photos is becoming more prevalent in student newspapers — an innovation that makes student paper layouts more lively and attractive, and often provides greater punch to the written copy.

At University of Ottawa, the two-newspaper tradition, where one newspaper was directed to English-speaking students and a second to French-speaking students, is to be abandoned in 1969-70. The two newspapers will be replaced by two bilingual publications, a magazine and a newsbulletin. The monthly magazine will be devoted to features and news editorials, with the semi-weekly bulletin covering news, services, activities and sports. The new publications at University of Ottawa are intended to rectify, according to the present editor, "the communal polarizations which have developed over the years between the French and English mentalities at our academe."

Along with these altered publications, the University of Ottawa students' union has purchased composing equipment "not only to reduce costs and to expedite production, but also with an eye to training and familiarizing individuals with basic press technology." The *Ontarion* also makes use of student-operated IBM DTT/ST composing equipment to prepare camera-ready copy. The *Gateway* is expecting to introduce a rotary press next year. The *Athenaeum* owns its own IBM typesetting and composing equipment, and the trend to student owned and operated equipment appears to be growing.

## FRENCH-LANGUAGE STUDENT PRESS

Those student newspapers which publish in French in the province of Quebec have evolved in a manner quite different from that of their English-language counterparts in the rest of Canada.

French-language student press has throughout the sixties been a political and literary press — political and literary in the Quebec nationalistic sense. It has promoted views of independence for Quebec, and has provided a serious vehicle for young Quebec journalists, novelists, and poets.

An activist press, French-language student newspapers withdrew from participation in Canadian University Press in 1963 to form their own Presse Etudiante Nationale, which survived for four years. P.E.N. members were closely allied with the developing Quebec student organization Union Générale des Etudiants du Québec (U.G.E.Q.), which dissolved with P.E.N., and with the demise of formally organized student unions on Quebec campuses.

U.G.E.Q. served as a unifying body for Quebec students of universities and classical colleges, and the student press produced at those institutions tended to reflect the ideologies of the organization. As student unions ceased to play a role on university campuses, the student press began to change its format and to draw on other than student-sponsored production methods.

Thus *Le Quartier Latin* has become a commercial, provincial newspaper which promotes the U.G.E.Q. ideology and seeks an audience broader than the University of Montreal faculty and student base. At Laval, the formerly produced *Le Carabin* has ceased to exist as a student medium. The administration of Laval University now produces the paper *Au fil des événements* and has consciously attempted to include student participation in the articles and planning of that newspaper, in order to fill the void caused by the absence of the student press.

For Laval, the situation is problematic, since the university edits the newspaper and tends to promote the value system which the administrative body endorses and maintains, while students would probably tend to promote other values than those of the administration.

Editor M. André Villeneuve describes the Laval publishing system as "paradoxical, even abnormal" and suggests that "means should be found at our university level to make a press controlled by the students economically possible without outside advertising revenue, or other control mechanisms."<sup>24</sup>

## STUDENT PRESS AND THE LAW

The student press in Canada is subject to all laws which affect all press in Canada — it has no immunity because it is non-professional or youthful. Thus, laws of libel, defamation, contempt of court, obscenity, distribution of false information, and regulations affecting the confidentiality of sources and privileged meetings are applicable to the student press.

Members of the student press provide instruction sessions for staff members on individual newspapers in those areas of the law which affect them, and legal seminars are sometimes conducted through Canadian University Press. Because of the increased possibility of legal repercussions, the use of satire in student magazines, journals, and newspapers has declined over the past five years.

Students are affected and confused by the laws concerning obscenity. The Criminal Code definition of obscenity as "any publication, a dominant characteristic of which is undue exploitation of sex or of sex and any one of the following subjects, namely, crime, horror, cruelty, and violence"<sup>25</sup> seems to students to be arbitrary and illogical. Students would define obscenity more in terms of the portrayal of illegitimate violence, unconnected with sex, since violence is more offensive to the student community generally than is sex.

An aspect of the application of statute laws to the student press which is not found in other media is the arbitrary application of the law by regulatory bodies (administrations, student councils, municipal authorities) without proceeding by due process, and in the past year at least three examples readily come to mind.

At St. Mary's University, the administration suspended the editor and a columnist of the *Journal* for publishing "an obscene article." The question of "obscenity" was never settled by the courts, but the administration served as prosecutor and judge, found the students guilty, and provided an either/or sentence: either retract and apologize, or forfeit academic standing.

At Sir George Williams University, the student council removed the editor of the *Georgian*, and indicated that one of the reasons for dismissal was the inclusion of libellous material in one edition of the publication. Threats of suit were apparently made by student council and administration lawyers — before the material had been

---

<sup>24</sup>Remarks to Special Senate Committee on Mass Media, February 10, 1970.

<sup>25</sup>Criminal Code, Section 150 (2)



printed. Following distribution of the newspaper, no legal action was taken through the courts, but the editor was nonetheless removed from his position.

The third example indicates how student press can be affected by laws which are applied out of context in order to stop distribution of student newspapers.

The high school (community newspaper) supplement produced by the *Ontarion* was banned from the city of Peterborough by city council on November 26, 1968, after an alderman called it "filthy, dirty, rotten, salacious." The student council at Trent University had arranged for Peterborough distribution with the *Ontarion*, and although the city council found the material objectionable, it was not prepared to "take it to court."

Six students were also found guilty of trespassing and fined \$10 each after distributing the same newspaper in Waterloo, Ontario. The newspaper contained Jerry Farber's article, "Student as Nigger," but once again, there was no determination by court procedure of the legality or illegality of the material contained in the supplement.

Recent cases where members of the student press have actually been allowed due process are few, and these have often been interpreted as attempts to censor the student press and disallow free comment, rather than to establish the legality of publication of certain material.

At the University of New Brunswick, the editor of the *Brunswickan* and a columnist were found guilty of contempt of court following a December 3, 1968 column which criticized court procedure in the New Brunswick Supreme Court case involving U.N.B. physics professor Dr. Norman Strax. The editor of the newspaper, John Oliver, was fined \$50; the columnist, Tom Murphy was found guilty and sentenced to ten days' imprisonment.

Defence lawyer Alan Borovoy of the Civil Liberties Association, and E. U. Schrader, chairman of the Journalism department, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute (who assisted in the preparation of the students' case), argued that the column was well within the bounds of "fair comment" and the sentencing was unduly harsh . . . and in large part a reaction against the previous *Brunswickan* support for Dr. Strax and opposition to the university administration and president C.B. MacKay.

Certainly, in the legal area, students are under more pressure than their commercial counterparts since they are subject to action by bodies other than the courts. And most student editors agree that they would prefer the courts to decide the merits of any charges against them—and further, that they have the right to demand court interpretation to replace arbitrary judgments with which they are now faced.

## CONCLUSION

While it is not the intention of this study to reach specific conclusions concerning the university press, certain observations and predictions can be made.

- 1 The student press, although not monolithic, has become increasingly "radical," and, through its commitment to the philosophy of serving as "an agent of social change," will probably continue in this vein for some time.
- 2 The student press can be expected to continue to extend its concerns to the community increasingly in the future, thus concentrating less on the university as an institution apart from society.
- 3 The student press is becoming increasingly independent – from advertisers, printers, student councils, and administrations – in its determination of policy, content and technique.
- 4 The student press is often subject to arbitrary application of statute law by student councils, administrations, and municipal authorities, who do not rely on courts for decisions concerning student newspaper material.
- 5 The student press can be expected to continue the non-objective reporting technique unless reaction from the student community is opposed to its use, thus rendering the newspapers impotent.
- 6 Administration newspapers will grow in number and quality, in large part as an alternative to the student press on campus, and as a medium for total coverage and examination of the university community.





## Chapter 4

### THE UNDERGROUND PRESS IN CANADA

*Barbara Sullivan*

Presently they all sat down to luncheon together. The mole found himself placed next to Mr. Badger, and as the other two were still deep in river-gossip from which nothing could divert them, he took the opportunity to tell Badger how comfortable and homelike it all felt to him. "Once well underground," he said, "you know exactly where you are. Nothing can happen to you, and nothing can get at you. You're entirely your own master, and you don't have to consult anybody or mind what they say. Things go on the same overhead, and you let em, and don't bother about em. When you want to, up you go, and there the things are, waiting for you."

The Badger simply beamed at him. "That's exactly what I say," he replied. "There's no security, or peace and tranquility, except underground. And then, if your ideas get larger and you want to expand — why a dig and a scrape and there you are! If you feel your house is too big, you stop up a hole or two, and there you are again! No builders, no tradesmen, no remarks passed on you by fellows looking over your wall, and above all, no weather. Look at Rat now. A couple of feet of floodwater, and he's got to move into hired lodgings; uncomfortable, inconveniently situated, and horribly expensive . . . No, up and out of doors is good enough to roam about and get one's living in; but underground to come back to at last — that's my idea of home!"

Kenneth Graham, *The Wind in the Willows*

## INTRODUCTION

"Underground press" is a term used to describe those publications which are produced to serve the "hip" community. As such, it is a type of *journal de maison* which vividly reflects a small community of people who have adopted similar life-styles and goals, and the contents of the underground press are not usually projected beyond that community.

The underground press in Canada serves as an alternate press — an alternate to the commercial dailies and weeklies and magazines that carry little material which relates directly to the hip community. It began as an experiment in journalism in many ways: a regional press, an innovator in newspaper design and interpretative reporting, and it became a spokesman for an alternate society and way of life.

Although the content and direction of the underground press is intended for the hip community, the readership of the underground press is far more extensive than the community itself, appealing to youth in the cities and urban areas, and to

sophisticated middle-class society. Underground press workers cannot explain this phenomenon, but do not discourage it because the added circulation helps to pay the bills. For the most part, the underground press does not serve as a crusading force to convince of the validity of the way of life chosen — rather, it attempts to speak to those who are already part of the community. On broader social issues, such as pollution, war, and famine, the underground press speaks to its total readership, within and without the community.

The hip community, or underground community, is composed of people who have withdrawn from the expected life pattern of North American society in opposition to its competitive nature and its emphasis on social approval. It is a community for whom “liberation” is a key word — liberation in speech, in ways of dress, in standards of achievement, in community life, and in sexual pursuits. It is a community for whom “co-operation” is a key word — a co-operation in communal living, which has been interpreted by members of the community as an outgrowth of “love,” the brotherly love which will eliminate war, poverty, injustice, and inequality. Although the hip movement is a social movement rather than a political one, it does see the illnesses of society (war, injustice, and so on) in part as a result of competitive capitalistic democracy, and of imperialist tendencies in governments which drive one group of people to seek power over another.

Because of the demands for freedom in the hip philosophy, a large part of the life-style of the hip community centres around and is the offspring of the use of drugs, and the hip community began as a community through the communal use of drugs for “mind expansion,” and a freeing of the conscious mind to accept new experiences and new phenomena.

One of the best explanations of the turning to psychedelic and hallucinatory drugs appears in Tom Wolfe’s unofficial history of Ken Kesey’s “Pranksters,” the original hip community in Haight-Ashbury, in San Francisco, California:

Under LSD, if it really went right, Ego and Non-Ego started to merge. Countless things that seemed separate started to merge, too: a sound became . . . a color! blue . . . colors became smells, walls began to breathe like the underside of a leaf, with one’s own breath. A curtain became a column of concrete and yet it began rippling, this incredible concrete mass rippling in harmonic waves like the Puget Sound bridge before the crash and you can feel it, the entire harmonics of the universe from the most massive to the smallest and most personal — *presque vu!* — all flowing together in this very moment. . .

This side of the LSD experience — the feeling! — tied in with Jung’s theory of synchronicity. Jung tried to explain the meaningful coincidences that occur in life and cannot be explained by cause-and-effect reasoning, such as ESP phenomena. He put forth the hypothesis that the unconscious perceives certain archetypal patterns that elude the conscious mind. These patterns, he suggested, are what unite subjective or psychic events with objective phenomena, the Ego with the Non-Ego, as in psychosomatic medicine or in the microphysical events of modern physics in which the eye of the beholder becomes an integral part of the experiment. Countless philosophers, prophets, early scientists, not to mention alchemists and occultists, had tried to present the same idea in the past, Plotinus, Lao-tse, Pico della Mirandola, Agrippa, Kepler, Leibniz. Every phenomenon, and every person, is a microcosm of the whole pattern of the universe, according to this idea. It is as if each man were an atom in a molecule in a fingernail of a giant being. Most men spend their lives trying to understand the workings of the molecule they’re born into and all they know for sure are the cause-and-effect workings of the atoms in it. A few brilliant men grasp the structure of the entire fingernail. A few geniuses, like Einstein, may even see that they’re all part of a

finger of some sort – So space equals time . . . All the while, however, many men get an occasional glimpse of another fingernail from another finger flashing by or even a whole finger or even the surface of the giant being's face and they realize that this is a part of a pattern they're all involved in, although they are totally powerless to explain it by cause and effect. And then – some visionary, through some accident –

– through some quirk of metabolism, through some *drug* perhaps, has his doors of perception opened for an instant and he almost sees – *presque vu!* – the entire being and he knows for the first time that there is a whole . . . other pattern here . . . Each moment in his life is only minutely related to the cause-and-effect chain within his little molecular world. Each moment, if he could only analyze it, reveals the entire pattern of the motion of the giant being, and his life is minutely synched in with it –

The Franksters never talked about synchronicity by name, but they were more and more attuned to the principle. Obviously, according to this principle, man does not have free will. There is no use in his indulging in a lifelong competition to change the structure of the little environment he seems to be trapped in. But one could see the larger pattern and move with it – Go with the flow! – and accept it and rise above one's immediate environment and even alter it by accepting the larger pattern and grooving with it – Put your good where it will do the most!

And putting the good where it does the most means putting it in the “community,” a community with a creed, a code, and a cult:

Their place is called the Nest. Their life transcends all the usual earthly games of status, sex and money. No one who once shares water and partakes of life in the Nest ever cares about such banal competitions again. There is a pot of money inside the front door . . . Everything is totally out front in the Nest – no secrets, no guilt, no jealousies, no putting anyone down for anything: . . . a plural marriage – a group theogamy . . . Therefore whatever took place – or was about to take place . . . was not public but private. “Ain't nobody here but us gods” – so how could anyone be offended? Bacchanalia, unashamed swapping, communal living . . . everything.<sup>1</sup>

This, then, is the “underground” community which the underground press mirrors, examines, and leads; a community made visual and obvious by communal living, exuberant costume dress, a unique vocabulary with American-Negro and psychedelic drug origins, and a philosophy of liberated individualism, of “doing your own thing.”

Because the hip community is regarded with suspicion by the larger, established, and more orthodox community, the underground press is also regarded with suspicion – and many misconceptions. The underground press in Canada is not a lascivious “sex” press, and those relatively new, New-York-originated “sex tabloids” (*Screw, Kiss, Pleasure*) are not part of the legitimate underground press, and do not exist in Canada. When sexual topics are treated in Canada's underground press, they are treated in the context of, and with the standards of, the hip community. The underground press is not an insidious political propagandist whose goal is to overturn society; rather, it is a community press which reflects a group of people who have chosen to live in a certain way – a social movement. As the underground press becomes more political, its political goals are people- and environment-oriented – elimination of poverty, racial and religious inequality, injustice, pollution, war, and inconsistent and “repressive” social standards.

---

<sup>1</sup>Tom Wolfe, *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1968), pp. 143-7, *passim*.



The underground press is a press of social protest on one level, and a press of community news and views on another. It is idealistic, like the community which spawned it, but is nevertheless suspect because it antagonizes (as does the hip community) the society it has rejected.

## UNDERGROUND PRESS PRODUCTION

### CATEGORIES

Two types of underground press are operative in Canada today, which, for purposes of this paper, will be described as legitimate underground and pseudo-underground.

The legitimate-underground press is composed of those newspapers which are written for and appeal to a community which is largely characterized by a common life-style, geographical proximity, and commitment. This group would include the *Georgia Straight* in Vancouver, *Octopus* in Ottawa, *Logos* in Montreal, and *Harbinger* in Toronto. While the audience of the legitimate underground press is not limited to this community, the newspapers reflect that community and are written primarily for it.

The pseudo-underground press is composed of those newspapers which have adopted the journalistic techniques of the legitimate underground press, much of the philosophy, but are directed to a community which has not adopted communal living and the total commitment to the hip way of life. These papers are most often produced by high school students, and sometimes by academics. This group would include *Sweeney* in Oakville, *Aquarius* in Saint Catharines, *Cabal* in Sudbury, *Youthquake* in Ottawa, *Both Sides Now* in Guelph, *This Paper Belongs to the People* in Kingston, and the lately defunct *Omphalos* in Winnipeg.

### THE LEGITIMATE UNDERGROUND PRESS

The *Georgia Straight* was founded in the fall of 1967, and early issues of the newspaper have now become "collector's items," selling for \$20 and more. It is published by Georgia Straight Publishing Co. Ltd., and printed by College Printers in Vancouver.

The photo-offset tabloid has a circulation of 10,000 to 15,000 and appears weekly on Fridays (tri-weekly from December to March). Highest circulation is directed to the hip communities in Vancouver, with secondary distribution in California, Toronto, and Montreal.

Edited by Dan McLeod (who holds a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of British Columbia), the content of the newspaper includes discussion of drugs, communal living, events, social issues within the context and reflecting the mores of the community. Staff members number about fifteen, but contributions in the form of poetry, photography, art, essays, and reviews are accepted. In addition to its regular content, the *Straight* has attempted to include a regular twelve page art supplement.

The newspaper is a member of the *Underground Press Syndicate* (U.P.S.) as well as being an associate of Liberation News Service (L.N.S.) thereby adding an international interpretation through material from these sources.



Since its inception, the *Straight* has been involved in a number of legal actions which will be outlined below in "The Underground Press and Canadian Law."

*Logos*, one of the largest underground newspapers in North America, is published in Montreal by Sagittarius Publishing Company, (a name which has been adopted for legal reasons; for the same reasons, Jean Untel is sometimes named as publisher). The offset tabloid appears monthly, and has made use of brilliant graphic techniques and colour in an attempt to project a mixed-media presentation through the use of print form. Circulation is 30,000 of which approximately 5,000 copies are directed to other Canadian cities and 5,000 to the United States, primarily New York.

Content is once again a reflection of the social concerns of the hip community, and editors point out that the newspaper validly reflects a community of approximately 2,000 people in the Montreal area. The newspaper started with a strong political base, evolved into a "street" or hip philosophy, and is now a synthesis of the writings and art-work of the eight-member editorial staff plus volunteer submissions from members of the community. All submissions are carefully scrutinized, with approximately 90 per cent rejected and 10 per cent accepted by the editorial staff.

*Logos* is financed by circulation sales (\$.25 per copy in Montreal, \$.35 elsewhere), borrowing and donations, advertising, and through the sale of graphics and promotional material to other papers and organizations. Like the *Georgia Straight*, *Logos* has faced legal actions, and, again, they are outlined below in "The Underground Press and Canadian Law." The editors emphasize their excellent working relations with the Montreal *Star*, and indicate with some surprise and amusement that *Logos* has become "the in-thing in middle-class homes—coffee-table literature in Westmount."

*Logos* is printed by Delpro Ltd. in Point Claire, and the lay out and use of colour has been described as a "visual declaration of freedom from tradition." Certainly, the newspaper is an experience in visual art as well as a verbal presentation of material. *Logos* is a member of U.P.S. and L.N.S., but rarely makes use of material from either source.

*Octopus* is published monthly in Ottawa by Octopus Publishing Company, and its co-editors are Richard Cain and Stephen Harris. Circulation is 8,000 — the bulk of distribution centred in Ottawa, and a few hundred copies distributed in Toronto and Montreal. *Octopus* is one of the original members of U.P.S., and although the content of the newspaper reflects an affinity with the international hip community, it projects an individual character which is representative of the particular needs and character of the local Ottawa hip group.

*Octopus* is an action-oriented newspaper, and one of its most recent campaigns (within and without the newspaper) has been against the police pressures on marijuana and hashish users, which, the editors say, have forced the hip community to use available impure drugs, and "hard stuff" — opium, speed (amphetamines, methamphetamines), heroin, and barbiturates. The staffers of *Octopus* also participate frequently in a television show, "Up Against the Wall," with Allison Gordon and Veronica Davis, on CJOH-TV in Ottawa.

Other subjects treated by *Octopus* include support for the Drop-In Centre in Ottawa, an examination of bail procedures, distribution of community information, and pollution of natural resources.

*Harbinger* is published in Toronto by Harbinger Publications, and its co-editors are Hans Wetzel and David Bush. Originally a paper designed to present entertainment and highly political material, *Harbinger* has now become a paper which is "part of the community," and, as a result of the change, has begun to include more literary and feature material than earlier in its history.

*Harbinger* claims a circulation of 10,000, an increase from the May, 1968, circulation of 3,000 to 4,000. A special effort is being made by distribution teams to enter the high school market, and, certainly, the appeal of this newspaper is to an age group younger than that of the audience for *Georgia Straight* or *Logos*. Distribution is aimed at three distinct groups: tourists who visit "the street" (Yorkville, in Toronto); the hip or "head" community centred in the city; and young suburban students. *Harbinger* is self-described as a "drop-out" paper, dedicated to "establishing a cultural esthetic — emphasizing 'goodness,' and that it is acceptable to be happy." Staffers on the *Harbinger* feel that the *Toronto Star*, the *Globe and Mail*, and the *Telegram* are "radical" newspapers by comparison with the *Harbinger* — which itself tends to be apolitical and dissociated from "establishment social problems."

## THE PSEUDO-UNDERGROUND PRESS

One newspaper definitely in the pseudo-underground category, and the most "academic" in the underground press, was *Omphalos*. *Omphalos* was published in Winnipeg until March, 1970, by two professors of English at the University of Manitoba, Len Anderson and Arthur Adamson. Its content was provincially oriented and served "to bridge the gap between what the media with vested interests judge as proper to report and what is actually happening." In describing its relation to the underground press, *Omphalos* stated:

About the hippie influence on *Omphalos* we have no apologies. One of our aims has been to start a dialogue between the generations; besides, the young people are putting out the most exciting, honest, imaginative newspapers in the world today . . . and moreover, they are doing it on very small budgets. We would be mad if we didn't use their talent, wit and experience to help us.

Before financial difficulties forced closure, the circulation of *Omphalos* fluctuated between 3,000 and 5,000. Its final issue was a joint effort with *The Manitoban* (the University of Manitoba student union paper), 40,000 copies of which were printed and given away free.

Other newspapers in the pseudo-underground category include *Sweeney* and *Cabal*, for example; newspapers produced by adolescents in smaller urban areas. These newspapers use the journalistic techniques of the underground press, record much of the philosophy and are often supported by youth centres or youth groups in the community in which they originate. Their appeal is most often to the high-school student, and many of the concerns and "causes" presented are representative of the high-school generation.

A newspaper not heretofore mentioned, and which could be included in the legitimate underground-press category, is the *Tribal Village*, in Toronto, published by Brian Henderson and edited by Jack Weston. Although not accepted as an underground newspaper by other components of the legitimate underground press, the *Tribal Village* is a member of the U.P.S. Its orientation and purpose is "entertainment". As such, it reviews and provides entertainment of particular interest to the hip community, but not limited to it. Occasionally, articles examining the direction of the hip community are included, and the newspaper is probably the most financially successful in the underground press.

## BUDGETS

Due to the facility of photo-offset production, and to its relatively low cost, an underground newspaper could be produced in any area of Canada with a budget of \$200 to \$250 per issue. Artwork, photography, and written material are donated by contributors, and the small membership fee in UPS ensures a budding underground newspaper of copy until that newspaper becomes established within the community.

Income is received through circulation, advertising, and, sometimes, through sale of graphic material and design work. Advertising revenue is usually meager, since advertisers are, for the most part, shops and industries which have a particular appeal to and find a market in the hip community — record and book shops, clothing outlets, craft shops, and entertainment outlets.

The production of underground newspapers is usually subsidized by the principals involved in the production — either through loans or gifts, with the ultimate goal of a profitable publishing venture. Printers will often be lenient with underground publishers, and several operate with a similar understanding to that with the *Octopus* — \$100 down at commencement of publishing, with the remainder due when money becomes available through sales and advertising revenue.

## CIRCULATION AND DISTRIBUTION

The circulation and distribution of underground newspapers is handled similarly by all underground press, through a two-tier system of vendors and store outlets.

The vendors of the underground press are people "from the street" who sell the newspapers on the street for a percentage of sales—usually about 40% of selling price. Vendors ordinarily do not participate in the production of the newspaper, and their relations are ordinarily with an agent who, again, receives a small percentage of sales revenue.

Regular staffers of underground press also seek out store outlets for sale of newspapers, and the stores which agree to carry the newspapers receive an identical percentage of sales revenue. The stores which carry the newspapers are ordinarily located in close proximity to "the street," or to university and college campuses.

In addition, through underground newspapers in other cities, newspapers are sold (at slightly higher prices) outside the local area. In those cases where this occurs, selling is ordinarily through the store outlets rather than on the street.



Several underground newspapers have had difficulty in maintaining street-sales due to local municipal by-laws, and this problem will be discussed below in "The Underground Press and Canadian Law."

## TECHNIQUES AND CONTENT

The underground press has been a highly innovative form of journalism — a reaction against the accepted layout techniques, spacing and standardization of advertising copy, and formal presentations of the commercial daily and weekly newspaper press.

Adopting the principles of modern art and Dada to newspaper design, the underground press is characterized by the use of collage, visual underlays behind type, split fountain colour, full-page photographs and hand-drawings, and over-large or hand-lettered headlines. To eliminate the cost of typesetting, underground newspapers are usually type-written in columns, and the original typewritten copy is applied directly to a collage-type paste-up sheet for photographing and reproduction. Experiments in the use of paper have been undertaken by some underground newspapers — the most obvious being the example of *Logos*, which has conducted trials with different weights and finishes of paper with virtually each issue.

Advertising is presented in the underground press without reference to the unofficial "rules" which have been customary for advertising placement in established newspapers. Three or four advertisements, composed into an artistic ensemble, may fill one page of the newspaper. Advertising may be placed in the centre of feature material, in top right hand corner of a page — anywhere it fits and assists to complete an artistic page arrangement.

Underground newspapers have maintained a policy of noneditorializing — that is, there is no particular column or space devoted to the editorial opinions of the newspaper as an institution. Each piece of writing included in an underground newspaper is voluntary, and highly subjective, thus producing an impression of collective action and opinion. Underground newspapers do not "cover" events as do their commercial counterparts; if someone feels like producing an article or piece of artwork or photography centred around a particular event or issue, he produces it, reporting subjectively his views concerning the event or issue. Consequently, contributors to underground newspapers tend to be involved (on one level or another) in the issue or event which is "reported."

Reviews play a large part in the content of underground newspapers, since cultural activities are important to the life-style of the community. The cultural activities reported range from opera to rock-folk music, from health-food recipes to talking to animals. Topics are off-beat from the vantage point of the entertainment section of a daily or weekly newspaper, but represent an exploration of cultural and artistic experience on the part of the hip community.

Editors of underground newspapers have tacit agreements not to copyright material which appears in the papers, and much material is exchanged and reprinted in other underground press throughout North America. Again, the interests and pursuits of the local community are taken into account in featuring material from outside the local environment. Recently, the Canadian underground press and its

American counterpart have presented and exchanged much material on pollution of air, water, and land resources on the continent, and the hip community has become involved in anti-pollution campaigns.

The journalistic innovations and graphic experimentation initiated by the underground press have recently been copied in some "above-ground" publications. There is still, however, a suspicion of the underground journalism in the established press, a suspicion often engendered through misinformation about and misinterpretation of the underground which appear in the established press.

Comics, which are often low-keyed editorials, have recently discovered the underground and student revolutions, and because of their high readership, can be persuasive in convincing of the "evils" of these movements. For example, "Apartment 3-G," a comic strip drawn by Alex Kotzky and carried in several Canadian daily newspapers, including the *Toronto Star*, could be said to have contributed to the persuasion through misinformation. "Archie" and "Lil Abner," also syndicated in Canadian dailies, have on occasion, joined the anti-underground cause, and underground journalists interpret the fact that the mass media continue to publish these strips as evidence of opposition to the validity of the underground press.

One above-ground newspaper which does, however, have excellent relations with the underground press is the *Montreal Star* — a paper described by underground journalists as having "beautiful people" on its staff. The *Star* has assisted with legal advice on at least one occasion, and has given fair and accurate coverage to the activities of the underground press, according to editors of *Logos*.

Certainly, underground journalists feel that since the established press purports to tell the truth to its readers in order to help them reach their own conclusions, it should reflect more truth in its reportage of the hip community and its press.

## UNDERGROUND PRESS ORGANIZATIONS

### UNDERGROUND PRESS SYNDICATE (U.P.S.)

The Underground Press Syndicate is an organization linking some 200 North American underground newspapers. For a \$25 membership fee, a new paper can join U.P.S. and receive copies of all other member newspapers on an exchange basis — from which they are allowed to reprint articles, artwork, and photographs at will.

Originally located in Phoenix, Arizona, U.P.S. now operates out of New York City — until such time as the administrator decides to relocate, when the organization will move with him.

U.P.S. held its first conference of underground press editors in Ann Arbor, Michigan in July, 1969, and Canadian underground newspapers were represented by the *Georgia Straight*, *Logos*, and *Harbinger*. *Octopus* staffers who attempted to travel to the conference by bus were turned away at the United States border and refused admittance to that country for carrying "anti-American literature" — copies of their newspaper.

In addition to the newspaper exchange service, U.P.S. maintains and distributes a "restricted list" of advertisers who have placed and withdrawn copy in underground



newspapers, or of individuals who have intimidated or threatened underground journalists in some way. A recent addition to the "restricted list" is Columbia Records Ltd., formerly the largest single advertiser in the underground press, whose decision to cease advertising in this medium was a prelude to the collapse of some twenty underground newspapers in the United States. In Canada, *Logos* investigated in late summer of 1969, the possibility of launching a suit against this company for withdrawing a contracted commitment for advertising in the newspaper.

One column which is syndicated through U.P.S., and which appears in an estimated twenty-five underground newspapers in Canada and the United States in "Dear Dr. Hip Pocrates," a medical-advice column written frankly and with wit by Dr. Eugene Schoenfield, thirty-four, staff physician at the University of California in Berkeley. Dr. Schoenfield began his column in 1967 in the *Berkeley Barb* since the above-ground press seemed unwilling to allocate much of its resources to medical problems and questions peculiar to youth. "Whatever information is available should be utilized," he says. "There needn't be censorship of any medical problem." Dr. Hip offers straight medical advice in answer to queries, and treats his replies with a humour that makes the information appealing to youth. His advice ranges from sexual information to warnings of dangers inherent in the use of certain drugs to common adolescent problems such as blemishes and obesity.

The following Canadian newspapers are members or associates of U.P.S.: *Harbinger*, *Octopus*, *Georgia Straight*, *Logos*, *Tribal Village*, *The Chevron*, *the Ubysey*, and, most recently, *Sweeney*.

#### LIBERATION NEWS SERVICE (L.N.S.)

Liberation News Service is an independent radical press service operating out of New York City, which supplies politically oriented graphics, news, and feature material to members, who pay subscription costs of \$15 monthly or \$180 annually. Copy deals substantially with radical political activities in the United States, and although *Harbinger*, *Logos*, and *Octopus* are members of the service, material from L.N.S. is used sparingly in these publications. L.N.S. copy, because it is carried in many U.P.S.-member papers, can be used by other U.P.S. papers occasionally without membership in the organization, and the *Georgia Straight* makes use of L.N.S. copy in this manner. Because L.N.S. copy and graphic material is mailed to subscribers, news is rarely of a fast-break nature and is used by Canadian underground press in feature reports that relate to the local community. As well, L.N.S. copy is used in reportage of major events involving youth — such as the demonstrations and police action at the Chicago Democratic National Convention in 1968. These events, although not directly related to the local community, are important and interesting to it, and L.N.S. material becomes the major news source for underground press for these events, and is supplemented by underground-press coverage from the community local to the event.

Much of L.N.S. material is highly political, and thus becomes less valuable for Canadian underground-press use. Where the local hip community becomes politically involved in connection with a social issue (an anti-pollution campaign,

for example), relevant L.N.S. material becomes more useful to the local underground newspaper. Again, use of L.N.S. material relates directly to the activity and interests of the hip community for which the underground newspaper is produced.

## UNDERGROUND PRESS AND THE CANADIAN LAW

Court decisions relating to the press have measurably increased since the birth of underground newspapers. The underground press and its supporters feel that the law has been used to force underground newspapers to cease publication. In some cases, the image of the city which local municipal leaders hold seems to influence the number of charges and actions brought against the local underground newspaper.

The *Georgia Straight* had its introduction to legal procedures after the publication of its third issue in the fall of 1967, when the Vancouver city license inspector suspended the newspaper's business license. Vancouver mayor Thomas Campbell had apparently ordered license inspector Milt Harrell to suspend the license on the grounds that the newspaper "was filthy and was being sold to children."<sup>2</sup>

On its first three issues, the *Straight* claimed a circulation of 50,000 to 60,000, and when publication resumed, circulation dropped to one-third of that. The *Straight* then brought suit against Mayor Campbell and inspector Harrell for damages of \$17,500 resulting from the suspension of the license. The newspaper's suit also asked that the Supreme Court of British Columbia declare that the section of the city charter under which the licensing inspector acted was invalid.

Appearing for the *Straight* was Federal Justice Department representative Norman Mullins, who argued that the section of the City Charter concerned – created by the British Columbia legislature – was invalid since it attempted to encroach on the freedom of the press – which only the federal government has the power to regulate. Mr. Mullins added that it was his opinion that the newspaper was closed because of its content, and that the withdrawal of the business license was a deliberate attempt to silence the newspaper. The *Georgia Straight* won its case on December 15, 1967, but Justice Thomas A. Dohm did not award damages to the newspaper.

Less than a year later, the *Georgia Straight* was charged with publishing defamatory libel against city magistrate Lawrence Eckhardt in an article written by Robert Cummings in the July 26, 1968 edition of the newspaper. The article announced that Magistrate Eckhardt had been awarded the "Pontius Pilate Certificate of Justice," and the charge quoted the article:

The citation reads: "To Eckhardt, Magistrate Lawrence – the Pontius Pilate Certificate of Justice – (unfairly maligned by critics, Pilate upheld the highest traditions of a judge by placing law and order above human considerations, and by helping to clear the streets of Jerusalem of degenerate non-conformists)."

The citation reads: "To Lawrence Eckhardt, who by closing his mind to justice, his eyes to fairness, and his ears to equality, has encouraged the belief that the law is not only blind, but also deaf, dumb and stupid. Let history judge your actions – then appeal!"

<sup>2</sup> Toronto Daily Star, December 15, 1967

The preliminary hearing began Wednesday, September 11, 1968, before Magistrate James Bartman of the British Columbia High Court. Prosecutor John Hall argued that the article was written and published with an intent to insult. Defense counsel John Laxton argued that this was not the case; that Magistrate Eckhardt had himself stated that he had been forced to apply an unjust and outdated law in a courthouse-fountain loitering case.

Magistrate Bartman found the *Georgia Straight*, editor Dan McLeod, and writer Cummings guilty as charged, and fined the principals a total of \$1,500. Money to pay the fines was raised through a benefit performance in which poet Allen Ginsberg came to the aid of the *Straight*.

On the day of Magistrate Bartman's judgment, September 20, 1968, the *Georgia Straight* was charged with seven counts of publishing and distributing obscene material (two counts of publishing and distributing against the *Straight*, two counts of publishing and distributing against editor Dan McLeod, and three counts of making, publishing, and distributing against cartoonist Zipp Almsy). Two additional charges of publishing and distributing obscene material against editor-in-exile George Tarasoff were withdrawn. The charges stemmed from the publication of a cartoon strip called "Acidman" drawn by Almsy, which featured prominent world figures in the nude, and which was considered by the *Straight* to be satirical political commentary. The *Straight*, its editor and cartoonist were found guilty of the seven charges in British Columbia provincial court, and fined a total of \$600. An attempt to appeal failed since the application for appeal was filed in the wrong court by the *Straight's* legal counsel.

Less than a year after this case, the *Georgia Straight* was again faced with charges against it — eighteen in all — all laid during the summer of 1969.

The first case, in which the *Georgia Straight*, editor Dan McLeod, and managing editor Robert Cummings were named, stemmed from the publication of an article entitled "Grow Your Seeds" on March 29, 1969. The article purported to describe the steps necessary to the successful cultivation of marijuana. The *Straight*, McLeod, and Cummings pleaded not guilty in provincial court to a charge laid by Miss Penelope Ann York of "counselling another person to commit an indictable offense, which was not committed." Dr. V.C. Brink, a professor at University of British Columbia's plant science department, testified that the article "was not a good set of instructions, but there were some points that would be helpful in growing marijuana to maturity." Defence counsel John Laxton said the charges were "a threat to the freedom of the press. Many newspapers give details of how crimes are committed. Is a newspaper guilty of counselling if it gives details of how those crimes were committed?"<sup>3</sup> On September 18, 1969, Provincial judge Bernard Isman found the *Georgia Straight* guilty and fined it \$1,500; Dan McLeod was found guilty, fined \$500, and placed on probation for three years; and charges against Cummings were dismissed.

On September 23, 1969, all charges of publishing obscene material against editor Dan McLeod, former managing editor Robert Cummings, and the *Georgia Straight* were dismissed. Similar charges were, however, laid on October 8, 1969, concerning an allegedly obscene "Dear Dr. Hip Pocrates" article. According to the *Straight's*

<sup>3</sup> *The Globe and Mail*, CP report, September 19, 1969.



counsel, charges have now been dropped. Other charges, dated October 16, 1969, and arising out of Ed. Sanders' article "The Great Pentagon Hunching Contest" (a satirical history of the "Yippies"), have not reached the courts to date.

Although editor McLeod has stated that he tries to rely on donations to assist with the cost of legal cases, the *Georgia Straight* raised its circulation price from \$.15 to \$.25 per copy. In addition, it is the policy of the paper to increase in size and quality following legal charges in order to assure its readership of a continuing and viable publication. Editor Dan McLeod feels that the charges against the newspaper have been open attempts at suppression of a free press, and that the trials have a political base – since city leaders and the premier of the province hold political views different from those of the *Georgia Straight*.

New Westminster, B. C., for example, passed a by-law in September, 1968, making it illegal to sell the *Straight* in the street. In fact, other newspapers were being similarly distributed without prosecution, according to a B. C. Civil Liberties Association spokesman. The Association, during the past two years, has assisted the *Straight* in challenging the ordinance in New Westminster (with the result that the paper is now sold without the previous harassment) and offered its protection against other forms of censorship.

Daily newspapers in Vancouver, while providing news coverage of the *Georgia Straight* trials, have neither supported nor objected to the *Straight* through editorial opinion. The *Straight* finds this surprising since it feels that when one area of the press is threatened through the application of law, all the press are threatened. The *Sun* and the *Province*, nonetheless, remain silent.

*Logos*, while not having faced as many legal battles as the *Straight*, has also had its initiation in the courts.

In June, 1968, eleven *Logos* vendors were charged and found guilty of selling the newspaper in the street, and each was fined \$40. Because the municipal by-law relates to magazines and pamphlets, *Logos* appealed the decision, and the higher court acquitted all vendors.

In October, 1968, *Logos* published a spoof on the *Montreal Gazette*, and headed the mock-*Gazette* with a story entitled "Mayor Shot by Dope-Crazed Hippie." Editor Paul Kirby and staff member Alvin Calder were then charged under section 166 of the Criminal Code with publishing false news. This section has been invoked twice since Confederation before this case – the first time, before the First World War, a case against an Alberta merchant resulted in a conviction; and the second, during the Second World War, a case in Quebec resulted in an acquittal. Sessions Judge Maurice Rousseau found Kirby guilty, but the conviction was quashed by the unanimous judgment of the Quebec Court of Appeal.

*Logos* also has one obscenity charge pending against it; a charge relating to the front cover of the newspaper which included a photograph in which pubic hair was shown. Trial dates have not yet been set for dealing with this charge.

Finally, *Logos* has been harassed by Montreal police in connection with infractions of a city by-law. Defense counsel Morris Fish has argued that the ordinance which forbids selling without a permit is not valid. The Superior Court has refused to reverse the convictions, and the matter is currently before the Quebec Court of Appeal.

In the fall of 1968, *Octopus* was also involved in a case in municipal court regarding the distribution of the newspaper, and vendors were found guilty of selling the newspaper on the Sparks Street Mall, prohibited by an Ottawa by-law. The Civil Liberties Association provided counsel for the *Octopus* vendors at that time, and continues to assist the newspaper by reading copy in advance of publication on request of the staff.

Until the fall of 1969, *Harbinger* had no charges against it, a situation which the editors attributed to the fact that Toronto as a city tended to be more cosmopolitan and less introspective than other cities in Canada. That autumn, however, the newspaper was charged with publishing obscene material, and the editors were fined a total of \$1,500. The charges related to the publication of a Christmas issue on the cover of which was featured a pen-and-ink drawing of a woman giving birth to a child. The original complaints leading to the charge were made by a fundamentalist Protestant minister. Benefits were held to raise funds to pay the fines, and the editors remained in jail only overnight.

Editors of *Harbinger* also report that police have harassed vendors of the newspaper by ordering them to "keep moving" in Yorkville where the newspaper has major distribution, but that their relationships with the law and its officers have been fairly healthy in Toronto otherwise.

That standards of the application of the law vary across the country is evident from the charges made against underground newspapers. *Logos* reprinted the "Dear Dr. Hip Pocrates" article which the *Georgia Straight* was charged for publishing, and no charges were laid. *Harbinger* carried "The Great Pentagon Hunching Contest," and no charges were laid. Equally interesting is the fact that application of municipal by-laws tends to vary within each city. Until the *Logos* case, no attempts to stop sale of newspapers had been made in Montreal. In Vancouver and New Westminster, the Salvation Army's *War Cry* is distributed in the streets, and no action is taken; with the *Georgia Straight*, however, by-laws are invoked.

It is no paradox to assert that the underground and its press thrive on opposition from the establishment and its press. Real inequalities before the law in a nominal democracy are one of the major *raison d'être* of the underground press, and so long as the establishment and its organs approve such inequalities, and at the same time hypocritically celebrate the egalitarian virtues of law in a democracy, the underground press will never be at a loss for copy and a reason for publishing it. It is not just a question of freedom of the press. What underground editors are asking is whether, given that mere geography seems to have a considerable effect on the formulation and application of laws, there can be such a thing as law — let alone such a thing as justice. Further, if special concessions are to be made to one section of society, or, more important, to its spokesmen — to the establishment and its above-ground press — why should similar concessions not be made to another section of society — the underground and its press? These are the questions being asked about principle and about consistency — questions ultimately about justice, and about people who don't ask questions.

### **Selected Bibliography**

Much of the material included in this paper was made available through interviews with editors of underground newspapers, who, along with underground press staffers, were most co-operative in providing information for this study.



- Baldwin, Laird, "GPs at War With the Army", *Montreal Star*, Aug. 23, 1969.
- Louttit, Neil, "Idealistic Journalism on a Shoe-String Budget," *Globe and Mail*, Aug. 16, 1969
- Paskal, Merrily, "Telling the Establishment where to Get On," *Montreal Star*, Aug. 23, 1969
- Paskal, Tom, "Warning — Adult Type Sex Material," *Montreal Star*, Aug. 23, 1969

#### **Selected Readings from**

*Georgia Straight, Octopus, Harbinger, Logos, Sweeney, Cabal, Berkeley Barb, East Village Other, Tribal Village, Screw, Kaleidoscope, The Rag, Los Angeles Free Press, New York Free Press, etc.*

#### **Selected Press Reports from**

*The Globe and Mail, Toronto Daily Star, The Telegram, and CP — all 1967-69*





